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## PREFACE

THIS is sometimes said to be an age of new theologies. It is at any rate an age when the old formulae and phraseology of theology are on their defence. On all sides the appeal is made, explicitly and implicitly, for an interpretation or re-interpretation of theological dogmas, in order to show the real truths involved in them, the conventional expression of which has to some extent ceased to carry a vital significance to modern minds. No theological student can be absolved from the attempt to satisfy this appeal. And few things can be of more value for such an object than tlie study of the Patristic writings of the second century; for in them we find Christian theology still in solution, and Christian thinkers still feeling their way towards systematic dogma; and we are enabled to gather what were the realities, of which they were looking for a suitable formulation. Among such writings the Apologies of Justin Martyr must hold an important place, just because they are in no sense a technical or esoteric treatise, but a plain statement in popular terms of Christian truth, such as a plain man in that age understood it.

The present edition conforms to the general plan of the series, to which it belongs. It is primarily intended for theological students; and it does not aim at doing more than giving general guidance for the understanding of the author's meaning. In preparing it, I have received constant and most valuable help from Dr Mason, the general editor of the series; and I am also indebted to a former colleague, Dr L. R. Farnell, for supplying me with some references bearing upon passages, in which points of Pagan mythology and cultus were alluded to. To these I desire to express my cordial thanks.

A. W. F. BLUNT.

Carrington Vicarage.
October 18th, i910.
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## INTRODUCTION.

I. Justiu's life.

JUSTIN was a native of Flavia Neapolis (the ancient Sichem), and was probably of heathen descent ${ }^{1}$. The exact date of his birth is unknown, but it must have been near the end of the first century. He himself tells us $^{2}$ that he was in his youth a zealous student of philosophy, and that he was converted in mature life to Christianity. Eusebius, who calls him $\gamma \nu \eta{ }^{\sigma} \sigma \iota \rho \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\grave{\lambda} \lambda \eta \theta o v ̂ s ~ \phi i \lambda o \sigma o \phi i a s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \sigma \tau \eta \varsigma^{3}$, states that after his conversion he continued to wear the philosopher's robe, and that he lived at Rome ${ }^{4}$; the latter fact is established by the evidence of the Apology itself. The details of his life are otherwise quite uncertain; but there is good reason for believing that he was martyred at Rome under the prefecture of Junius

[^0]Rusticus (A.D. $163-167)^{1}$, during the Principate of M. Aurelius ${ }^{2}$. Eusebius tells us that his death was due to the intrigues of Crescens, the Cynic; but the evidence adduced for this statement is very weak, consisting only of an ambiguous passage from Tatian ${ }^{3}$, which may itself be due, so far as it relates to Justin, to the passage where Justin states that he is anticipating persecution owing to the hostility of Crescens ${ }^{4}$. It has been suggested ${ }^{5}$ that a loculus in a gallery of the first floor of the catacomb of Priscilla may mark his burial-place, as it has painted on it the inscription MZOYCTINOC, where M perhaps stands for Máp $\quad$ us.

## Justin's Apologies.

Justin must have been a prolific writer; but few of his works have survived, and many of those ascribed to him in the MSS are undoubtedly spurious. The Apologies and the Dialogue are certainly genuine;

[^1]but there are no others which can be confidently accepted as his work. The Apologies are the type of apologetic literature, and had a distinct influence on the writings of subsequent Apologists (though there is little to show that they were much read after Eusebius' time, if we except the citations in the Sacra Parallela of John of Damascus). In these Justin gives no formal or logical exposition, scarcely even an outline, of a complete Christian system. His purpose is merely to collect arguments to justify fair and equitable treatment of the Christians by the authorities, and to support his demand that they should not be condemned unheard. With this object he seeks to refute the popular calumnies against the Christians, he insists on the excellence and truth of the Christian teaching and on the effects which it produces, and he struggles to prove the claims of Christ, especially by the argument from the fulfilment of prophecy ${ }^{1}$. Thus, although he is dogmatic to a degree exceptional among Apologists, owing to the fact that he concentrates his argument round the Person of Christ, yet it is futile to seek in the Apologies for a formulated system of Christian theology.

His style has no artistic greatness, except a certain vein of sarcasm ${ }^{2}$; though he can sometimes rise to an occasion ${ }^{3}$. In general the style is, though fluent, yet careless and diffuse; his reasoning is sometimes rambling and fanciful, abounding in digressions, repetitions, and parentheses, which confuse the argument ; and the construction of his sentences is often clumsy. His merits as a writer are due to moral rather than artistic qualities.

[^2]The straightforward boldness of his language is remarkable; he gives a decided impression of earnestness, candour, and thoughtfulness; and his Christianity is tinged with a liberality of mind that produces in him a reverence for truth and nobility of character, wherever they are found. He is, however, not a deep thinker; he betrays many symptoms of an uncritical disposition ${ }^{1}$, though possibly he was not in this respect behind the standard of his age ; nor is he entirely free from clear errors of fact ${ }^{2}$. In general he appears as a man of respectable rather than remarkable talent, well-read and well-educated (though far inferior in learning and scholarShip to Clement of Alexandria), but with very few claims to be considered an original thinker, standing, as regards power and independence of mind, at a much lower level than his disciple Tatian.

## Place in history.

The importance and interest of Justin's writings are due to his historical position in the development of Christian thought. His writings were well known to and freely used by later authors such as Tatian, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian. He was one of the first who tried to reconcile Christian theology with philosophy, and to justify Christianity to the ordinary world of Greek culture. He represents therefore the fusion of Christianity with the Greek spirit. He sees foreshadowings of the truth in the old mythology, and does not shirk the argument from comparative religion ${ }^{3}$; his treatment of heathenism is not bigoted, though he

[^3]holds that its immoralities and corruption show it to be a trick of the demons. He is to some extent influenced, on the ethical side, by Stoicism, but he insists upon the doctrine of free-will in opposition to the Stoic fatalism ${ }^{1}$. He disliked the Epicureans as licentious ${ }^{2}$, and the Cynics as unprincipled ${ }^{3}$. His chief mental prepossessions are Platonic. He was, by his philosophical training, an enthusiastic Platonist ${ }^{4}$. He probably did not get from Plato his Trinitarianism or his general conception of a personal God, though he often puts it in Platonic form ; and he is not incapable of unwittingly parodying Platonic thought, as he parodies Old Testament prophecies ${ }^{5}$. His Platonism is therefore not more profound than his general thought ; but it shows itself in constant reminiscences, in frequent comparisons between Platonic and Christian doctrine, and in an open and whole-hearted admiration of Socrates ${ }^{6}$. He assumes that, so far as Christianity and philosophy are both true, they cannot be opposed to one another, but must be the product of the same Logos. But he considers that Christianity possesses the whole truth, whereas Greek philosophy possesses only a part, and a debased part, of the truth ${ }^{7}$.

It is a great mistake to represent Justin's theology as little more than popularized heathen philosophy ${ }^{8}$, or to lay equal stress upon the heathen and Christian elements in it ${ }^{9}$, just as it is a mistake to treat him as a Jewish Christian of the Ebionitic type ${ }^{10}$, or as a Vatican Romanist of the most developed orthodoxy ${ }^{11}$.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. ii $6(7)$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. ii 15. ${ }^{5}$ Cf. i $60 . \quad{ }^{3}$ Cf. ii $8(3)$.

He is rather a type of the 'plain man,' firmly believing in Christ, and yet at the same time reluctant to abandon the principles of secular philosophy, and attempting to find a formula which shall allow the two to be harmonized. Many of the subjects of later controversy do not come at all within his purview, and some of his language certainly contains potentialities of theories which were later condemned by the Church ${ }^{1}$. But his general standpoint is that of common-sense orthodoxy of the primitive type, combined with a distinct liberality and tolerance for imperfect approximations to Christian belief in pre-Christian systems, such as is a creditable characteristic in many of the early Fathers. At the same time his view of Christianity is not entirely the same as that which is most prominent in the Apostolic writings ; at least the emphasis is different. Justin has but small concern with doctrinal ideas. He makes little of Atonement and Redemption, compared to the function of Christianity as an attestation of rational truth. This may be partly due to the purpose which the Apologies were intended to serve; but it must also be due to the temper of the author's mind. He was rather a philosopher and a moralist than a theologian or a mystic; and so the chief interest which Christianity possessed for him was as the true philosophy theoretically, and the right law of life practically. In this respect he is representative of his age. As Dorner points out ${ }^{2}$, for all the early Christian writers Christianity is the philosophy кат $\epsilon \xi \xi^{\prime} \chi \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$, and was only saved from evaporation in vague spiritual emotion by the growth of a Canon giving an objective representation of Christian truth (as contrasted with the guôsis and with Montanism, which

[^4]are definitely anti-historical). And so, while Justin is of little importance in the development of scientific Christian theology (his only notable contribution being the theory of the spermatic Logos), yet his writings are of abiding interest, as showing us the manner in which liberally-minded men of ordinary talent and culture were seeking, in the second century, to express the fundamentals of the Christian faith in terms which should commend themselves according to the canons of current philosophical thought. As an Apologist he was compelled to lay small stress upon the technical doctrines of Christian theology, and to present Christianity rather as a system of philosophy ${ }^{1}$ (philosophy being then treated as a rule of life and not as a mere intellectual system), than as a method of Redemption. But Justin was undoubtedly predisposed to this apologetic standpoint, not only by the general tendencies of his time, but also by the special quality of his own mental habit. The conditions, under which apologetic treatises had to be written, suited his own bent, and the bent of his time. His works therefore are not to be estimated so much by their anticipations of points of subsequent theological controversy, as by the picture, which they give, of the attitude of ordinary Christians of the second century towards the Christian faith, and of the method in which they approached the problem of reconciling Christian doctrine with secuiar thought. It was necessary to prove that Christianity was 'rational,' before the heathen world could accept it ; and not till that point had been disposed of, could Christian thinkers proceed to examine technically the dogmatic implications contained in the simple statements of the New Testament.

[^5]
## Christianity and the State.

The broad plea of the Apologies is that Christianity should be treated on the same lines as any other philosophy. It was not likely that this suggestion should be favourably received by the authorities. Christianity was the first system which was definitely antagonistic to the State religion. Other philosophers had acquiesced in the State gods as a political expedient, without necessarily believing in them. Christianity flouted them. $]$ It is true that Judaism had been similarly opposed to the State worship. But, though Jews were not averse from proselytism, yet their religion was exclusive rather than, like Christianity, aggressive. Moreover Judaism was a national religion ${ }^{1}$ and, as such, a fit subject for Roman toleration (which was a matter of high politics), whilst the Christians represented no particular nation. Thus we find that, despite occasional Jew-baiting, the Jews were on the whole tolerated in the East (though not to the same extent in the West) under the early Emperors, partly because the kings of Judaea were closely connected with the Imperial family, partly because Rome conccived herself to be carrying on what had been the general policy (with the exception of the interlude during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes) of the Seleucid kings. Even after A.D. 70, when the Jewish State came to an end and the centralization of worship at Jerusalem was suppressed, and after the risings of A.I. II 6 and I30 had been crushed, the [Jews were still released from such civil and military duties as were incompatible with their faith.] But the growth of Judaism in the West, and of

[^6]Christianity regarded as a Jewish sect, awoke the watchfulness of the authorities. Hadrian made circumcision penal, and Pius allowed it only to children of Jewish descent, i.e. conversion to Judaism was penalized, obviously as being an attack on the State religion. Christianity therefore stood in a different position from Judaism. Nevertheless the government, as such, was not on the whole bitterly hostile to the Christians in the early days of the Empire; as a rule it did not institute persecution against them, and tried to secure to them a fair trial. Where persecution arose, it was usually due either to considerations of political expediency or to popular clamour. Thus the Apologists' work was likely to do good among the people, by protesting the moral innocence of the Christians, by spreading a knowledge of the Christian position, and by refuting popular calumnies.

EAt the same time Christianity was legally a religio illicita, and the confession of Christianity was a legal ground for punishment, being tantamount to a secession from the State cult; and this position of affairs was bound to continue, so long as the Emperors conceived it to be a part of their policy to maintain the State religion as revived by Augustus. Hence, though the practice of individual Emperors might vary, and though some might attempt to make the conditions more equitable to the Christians, the theoretical policy was always the same towards them. The Apologists ignore the existence of this political necessity; indeed, from their point of view, they had no option but to do so. But, so long as the necessity was an acknowledged maxim of State policy, Apologies could effect no amelioration in the legal position of the Christian religion.

Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, the two

Emperors to whom the Apologies are addressed (Verus may be neglected as of subordinate importance), were among the best of the Roman Emperors. Antoninus was a man of simple and temperate life, of estimable and honourable character, and personally religious in temperament. It is to his credit that he infused a stronger spirit of equity and humanity into Roman law, and endeavoured to facilitate the enfranchisement of slaves. Though he did not discountenance the laying of informations against Christians, he was disposed to be tolerant towards them ; he did not encourage official inquisition for them, and at the end of his reign he intervened to stop persecution of them in the cities of Asia and Greece. In short, he discouraged the practical exercise of the law against Christianity. M. Aurelius is one of the best types of the neo-Stoicism of Rome; [he was animated with a sincere desire for moral perfection, regulated by the Stoic principle of obedience to duty; [and he had an earnest zeal for the service of mankind, based upon the principles of brotherly love and forgiveness. He continued the policy of Antoninus in legislation and in the administration of justice. But his doctrinaire sense of duty to society caused him to countenance the persecution of Christians, and to regard their refusal to worship the State gods as sheer obstinacy ( $\psi \iota \lambda \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho a ́ \tau a \xi \iota s^{1}$ ). The rescript, which he issued in A.D. 177, providing for the punishment of new sects which excited popular feeling, led to an outbreak of popular animosity against the Christians at Lugdunum.

[^7]
## II．Justin＇s theology．

Although，as has been said，the Apologies are not intended to give a complete or systematic exposition of Christian doctrine，yet they contain in solution most of Justin＇s main ideas ；and the indications，which they afford，of his notions of Christian truth are numerous enough to enable us，by piecing them together，to make a general outline of his theological position．

The Father．Like the majority of early Christians， Justin is fundamentally and primarily a monotheist． The conception of One God is with him an axiom ；he does not argue in its favour，but merely assumes it as the basis of faith．In this point his Platonic training and his Christian belief are entirely at one． He is lavish of epithets to express the unique transcendence of the Only God．He is à $\gamma^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \tau o s($（ 14 ，I ：ii 5 （6），I etc．），

 （ib．），àтa甘ヴs（i 25,2 ），$\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu(\mathrm{i} 13,4$ ）， $\pi a \tau \eta ̀ \rho \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu(\mathrm{i} 8,1$ etc．），$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \eta \varsigma \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$（i 12,9 ：

 67,2 ）．It is difficult to decide whether Justin did or did not reject the belief in the eternity of matter．The passage in i Io， 2 is certainly ambiguous（see note $a d$ loc．）． And it is possible that the influence of Plato might have affected his ideas on the subject（cf．i 59，I），though the problem of Plato＇s theory of matter is by no means an easy one．It is probable，however，that the distinction between a world made by God out of matter which He had not made，and a world made by God out of matter which He had made，scarcely suggested itself with any
definiteness to Justin. And there can be no question that in his view God was transcendently and uniquely supreme, unbegotten Himself and the begetter of all things. At the same time he does not treat God as abstractly or metaphysically simple and without attributes. [God is metaphysically incomprehensible, but Justin does not fail to emphasize His moral personality and His personal interest in the affairs of mankind. He calls Him татウ̀
 speaks of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \sigma v ่ \nu \eta$ and $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma v \dot{\nu} \eta$ and $\phi \iota \lambda a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i ́ a$
 larly God is termed $\tau \hat{\omega \nu} \pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu$ є่ $\pi о ́ \pi \tau \eta s$ סíкаьos (ii 12,6 ), and His concern in human conduct is asserted (ii 3 (4), $2: 7,1$ ).
[The Logos. So far then Justin's monotheism is quite simple to understand. It is a theory of One Supreme God, who transcends human comprehension, but nevertheless possesses a moral Will and exercises it in the supervision of terrestrial events. The problem, therefore, that lay before the Apologist was that of finding room in his monotheistic system for a second Divinc Person, without falling into Ditheism on the one hand, or into materialistic views of a Son of God on the other, such as had been characteristic of heathen mythology. This difficulty Justin attempted to overcome by the theory of the Logros, which is the central pivot of his theology. He uses the word in a double sense ${ }^{1}$; the Logos is both the Creative Word, the agent in creation (i 64,5 : ii $5(0), 3$ ), and also the Divine Reason, the sum of Divine truth (ii IO, I). In this respect Justin's

[^8]conception is not quite the same as that of St John's Gospel, where the Logos is rather considered in the former aspect. It bears more analogies to Philo's use of the term. But there is no proof that Justin was consciously borrowing his ideas from Philo. He uses the Logos doctrine as if it were not novel, but fully naturalized in the Church, and a prevalent method of interpretation. It may be doubted whether he derived it from the fourth Gospel, though it is possible that that Gospel was held to sanction the use of the term in the thought of the Church ${ }^{1}$. But Justin's version of the Logos doctrine seems, in the process of exposition at any rate, to start from a general philosophic conception, such as was current in the schools of the time, especially among the Stoics.]

It was a maxim of current philosophy that Reason, $\lambda$ óyos, is what unites God and man, and allows man to know God; and here probably can be found Justin's starting-point. A very slight effort of personification was needed in order to avoid the pantheism to which this theory, when crudely stated, easily led. And the means for this was provided by the Church doctrinc of Christ as the Incarnate Logos. According to this, the Logos represented a distinction in the Divine essence. He was diverse $\dot{u} \rho \iota \theta \mu \hat{\omega}$, though not $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \hat{\eta}$, from the Father (cf. ii $5(6), 3$ ). But nevertheless He proceeded from the Father, and His mission in all ages had been to interpret the Father to man. Thus the Old Testament manifestations were given by the $\operatorname{Logos}$ (i 63,10 ) ; and indeed all approximations to the truth, of which any man in any age had been capable, had been due to

[^9]His work（i 5,4 ：ii 7 （8）， I ）．In fact it is not always easy to decide whether Justin is using the word $\lambda$ óyos in the abstract sense，or as a title for a definitely－con－ ceived Person（e．g．in i $10,6: 64,5:$ ii 9,4 ）．And so Justin arrives at his great theory of the $\lambda_{\text {óyos }} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a-$ tuкós．Previously to the advent of Christ，men had possessed seeds of the Logos，and so had been enabled to arrive at such fragments of truth as they could grasp （i $32,8: 46,3:$ ii $8,1: 10,2: 13,3$ ；cf．i 28,3 ）．The Logos was thus the eternal and universal source of all goodness and all truth，and in every age $\dot{o}$ vovvє $\chi \eta$＇ 9 ，as such，would obey His commands（i i 2,8 ），and to that extent could even be called a Christian（i 46,3 ）．
［And now this Logos，formerly apprehended only in fragmentary fashion，had in entirety become incarnate in the historical Christ．The dispensation of the $\lambda$ ó $⿴ 囗 ⿱ 一 一 s$ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s ~ h a d ~ n o w ~ y i e l d e d ~ t o ~ t h a t ~ o f ~ t h e ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~$ $\mu о \rho \phi \omega \theta \epsilon i ́ s(i 5,4)$ ．In Christ was embodied тò 入оүıкòv тò ö ő $\alpha o \nu$ ］（ii 10,$1 ; c f$. i 46,2 ）．Thus，though a quanti－ tative distinction could be drawn between the Persons of the Father and the Logos，yet the doctrine of their absolute and necessary moral unity precluded any di－ theistic inferences．Father and Son were not separate parts of the Godhead．The Logos was the Logos of God，and not an unbegotten subsistence like the Father． Indeed Justin was so anxious to lay stress upon this point that he has been accused of subordinationist tendencies．So far as the Apologies are concerned， there are only four passages which give the slightest ground for such an accusation．Of one，viz．i 13，3， it is possible to say at once that it may be dismissed as irrelevant．The assertion，which is there made，that Christ is honoured $\epsilon \mathcal{\nu} \nu \delta \varepsilon v \tau \epsilon ́ p a \quad \chi \omega_{\imath} \rho a$ ，refers to the position of the Incarnate Word in liturgical worship，
and not to His position absolutely as a Person in the Godhead. The same is probably the case with regard to the passage in ii 13,4 . The phrase in i 32 , ro denotes logical precedence rather than the absolute subordination of the Son to the Father ${ }^{1}$. But the words used in i i 2,7 are less susceptible of being explained in a Nicene sense, though they are not so strongly tinged with subordinationist ideas as the passage in Tryph. I28. And there can be little doubt that Justin, in his anxiety to avoid any danger of representing God as qualitatively distinct from the Logos, or as suffering change by the procession of the Logos, tended to fall into an opposite error. He was so eager to escape all appearance of Ditheism that he can scarcely be held to lay sufficient stress upon the equality of Son and Father, as touching their Godhead. But it needed a longer process of reflexion and controversy, before the Christology of the Church could be properly formulated. And it is undeniable that Justin held firmly the doctrine, which is ultimately incompatible with strict Subordinationism, viz. that the Logos is of the essence of God and not parallel to a creature. This essential Divinity of the Son is unceasingly asserted in the Apologies. Justin calls Him ó $\pi a \rho ’$ aủtov̂ ( $\tau o \hat{v} ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v})$ viós (i 6, 2), $\theta \in \hat{\imath ̂ o s ~(i ~ 10, ~ 6), ~}$
 other phrases are less vague ; He is $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$ र́́ $\nu \nu \eta \mu a$ тồ

 (i 23,2 ; cf. also i 46,2 ), or again 入ójos каi $\pi \rho \omega \tau о ́ т о к о s ~$ ஸ̀v тô̂ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ кai $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ i ́ \pi a ́ \rho \chi є \iota ~(i ~ 63, ~ I ~ 5), ~ o r ~ l a s t l y ~ H e ~ i s ~$ нóvos $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs кvрíms viós, ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi o \iota \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$

[^10]$\kappa \alpha \grave{\sigma} \sigma \nu \grave{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu о \varsigma \kappa \tau \lambda$. (ii 5 (6), 3). These passages make it clear that Justin did not regard the Logos as inferior in essential Divinity to the Father, although some occasional phrases, which he uses, show that he had not firmly grasped the complete implications of his own view.
[The Logos therefore, according to Justin's theology, is God's Creative Word and the Divine Reason, the first-begotten of God, God's agent in creation and His instrument in pre-Christian theophanies, the source of all human truth and goodness; He is quantitatively diverse from the Father, and is sometimes represented as subordinate to Him ; but at the same time He is regarded as the only and absolute Son of God, in a sense in which that title can be applied to no other person, for He is begotten, not created. In short the Logos 'was with God and was God.'] It is open to doubt, however, whether Justin also believed that the Logos was 'in the beginning,' or whether he was inclined to actualize Him only as related to the world. The crucial passagre bearing on this point in the Apologies is
 o 入óyos $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi о \iota \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~ к а і ̀ ~ \sigma \nu \nu \grave{\nu \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu ळ ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \varsigma, ~}$



 ои้к oैрони́ є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$. The usual interpretation of this pas-
 $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu 0$, has appeared to some to present a difficulty of theology, by making, apparently, the statement that the Logros was not begotten, until the world was created as a кór $\mu o s ;$ He had existed before in some sense, $\pi \rho o$ $\tau$. $\pi$. $\sigma v \nu \omega \nu$, where $\sigma v \nu(\dot{e} \nu$ can scarcely imply mere exist-
ence as an attribute ${ }^{1}$, but rather union in a common life or conception ; but His begotten existence, i.e. in diversity from the Father, began at the creation. This view appears to Dorner ${ }^{2}$ so inconsistent with the many passages, in which Justin asserts the begetting of the Son before the creation of the world, that, to avoid the inconsistency, he suggests the textual alteration of öтє to öт七. And Donaldson ${ }^{3}$ suggests that the clause öтє... $\epsilon \in \kappa о ́ \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ should be taken in conjunction with $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s$ $\lambda$ éyєtal, the meaning then being that the Son was entitled $\chi \rho \iota \sigma$ tós at the creation. But this reading of the words seems somewhat unnatural. And it may be questioned whether the difficulty of theology suspected in the other method of interpretation is not fictitious. It is scarcely conceivable that Justin could ever have thought the generation of the Son to be coincident with the act of creation; nor could this passage be taken to have that meaning, which could only be given if Justin had written $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon i s$ instead of $\gamma \in \nu \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \in \nu o s$. The öтє clause must be attached, moreover, not only to $\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega$ '$\mu \epsilon \nu o s$ but also and equally to $\sigma \nu \nu \omega \nu$; it simply interprets and develops $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \iota \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. The phrase каì $\sigma \nu \nu \omega \nu$ каi $\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ expresses the same idea as was later expressed by Origen's phrase 'eternal generation.' It implies that He who 'is with ' the Father is nevertheless in process of 'being begotten,' and that this was the state of things 'before the creatures were made,' 'when at the beginning God through Him created and ordered (or beautified) the universe.' It is plain that, though Justin may not have definitely put to himself the question how long the Logos had been with the Father, yet he

[^11] c. 3, p. 22 I.

[^12]regarded Him as essentially Divine, begotten not made, and therefore holding a position quite unique and distinct from any creature. No doubt his Christology is not very clear, nor his view of the Logos free from confusion ${ }^{1}$. He was struggling with the difficulty of a conception, which the Church had not yet had time to discuss fully. No phrase of his is so definitely Arian as Tertullian's Fuit tempus cum filius non fuit (adu. Hermog. c. 3). He allows for a state of pre-existence of the Logos, though he tends to regard it rather as a potentiality until the creation ${ }^{2}$; and he seems to regard this state as having endured 'from the beginning.' But it is not wonderful that he could not clearly understand all the difficulties of Christological doctrine, nor anticipate all possible points of future controversy. At least he is firm to the great Christian doctrine that the Logos is essentially God, not a creature but a $\gamma$ '́v $\nu \eta \mu a$, and so unique in the universe. And thus he saves his Christianity from Ditheism, by representing the Logos as always with God, quantitatively separated from the Father by process of begetting, but one in nature and will with Him, causing no break in the unity of the Godhead.

The Incarnation. And this Logos became incarnate in Jesus Christ (ii 10,8$)^{3}$, by the will of God (i 23.2 : $465: 63$, 10: ii $5(6), 5)$. His birth was miraculous (i $32,11: 33,4: 46,5$ ), but His life was fully human (i 31,7 ). The purposes of the Incarnation are not systematically explained, but they are broadly alluded to as being ( 1 ) the salvation, transformation, purification, and restoration of the human race (i $23,2: 32,7: 63,16$ ); (2) the conquest of death $\left(\mathrm{i} \sigma_{3}, 16\right)$; (3) the defeat of the

[^13]demons (ii $5(6), 5)$; (4) the revelation of the unnameable God (i 63, 5). And this the Logos achieved by His teaching (i $6,2: 23,2: 63,5:$ ii 10,8 ), and by His sufferings (i $32,7: 63,10,16$ : ii 13,4 ). He is now reigning over the world and helping those who believe in $\operatorname{Him}(\mathrm{i} 4 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}: 42,4: 50,12)$; and He shall come again to judge mankind (i 52,3 ). Justin's doctrine of the Incarnation, as stated in the Apologies, lays most stress upon its didactic purpose, and upon Redemption mainly as effected by its 'subjective' influence, as a redemption from sin rather than from guilt and punish- ' ment. There is no systematic treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement, no hint of a ransom to Satan, and scarcely any trace of a theory of 'satisfaction.' In this respect Justin is as primitive as he is in his Christology. But, as has been said, he was the creature of his age ; his bent was not so much to theological speculation as to the highly practical philosophy of his time ${ }^{1}$; and the interest of his writings is due not so much to any expert discussion on points of controversial theology, as to the revelation of the ordinary attitude of a right-minded and well-educated Christian of the second century towards the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

The Holy Spirit. Justin has very little to say about the Holy Spirit as defined by scientific theology. In his language concerning Him he seems to vacillate between treating Him as a Person and as a mere attribute. He never speaks of Him, in the Apologies, as God, nor alludes to His mode of existence. He appears to have accepted Him as a distinct object of liturgical worship (i 6, $2: 13,3: 60,7: 6 \mathrm{I}, 3,13: 67,2$ ), but not

[^14]B.
to have concerned himself with speculations as to His being or distinct personality. Furthermore he scarcely draws any distinction, or at least draws it very unsteadily, between the Logos and the Spirit. Thus he commonly regards the Spirit as the instrument in Old Testament prophecy, the $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$, subordinate to God and under God's control (i 33, 2: 44, II) ; and yet in i 36 , I: ii 10,8 this function is ascribed to the Logos. Similarly the äqıov $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ is spoken of in i 33,5 as the agent in the Incarnation; but in $\S 6$ of the same chapter (and again in i $46,5: 66,2$ ) the Logos is described as performing this work (and so the Incarnation is not only due to the Father's will, but is also a voluntary act on the part of the Logos). This can be explained as a mere confusion of functions ${ }^{1}$, though it looks remarkably like a real confusion of Persons. But the fact is that the early Church was very slow in grasping the full meaning of the idea of the Holy Spirit, and Justin himself plainly did not know, or had not considered, what to make of the conception. The Trinitarianism of the Apologies is therefore crude and unsettled. So far as the Third Person in the Trinity is concerned, Justin seems to have accepted Him on the authority of the Church's liturgical formulae, without thinking it necessary to speculate upon His relation to the Father and the Son or His distinct sphere of operation. It might even be possible, on the evidence of i 6,2 , to maintain that the Holy Spirit stood for Justin in no higher position than that of the angels. But that supposition is scarcely consistent with the place which he elsewhere assigns to Him, as next to the Father and the Son, in the baptismal and cucharistic formulac. The passage

[^15]quoted should not be strained to bear too definite a meaning. In that chapter Justin is seeking to show that the Christians are not atheists; he does so by simply enumerating the objects of their worship and reverence ; and though he names the Holy Spirit after the angels, it is yet an extreme inference that he therefore considered Him to be no more than, or even inferior to, the angels. Maran suggests that in that passage Justin intends the word $\sigma \in \beta o \mu \in \theta a$ alone to refer to the angels, and $\sigma \epsilon \beta \dot{\beta} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каì $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ to refer to the Three Persons of the Godhead. This is not an impossible theory. But even if it be correct we must admit that Justin's expression is somewhat loose and untechnical, and it seems clear that he had not attained to any scientific conception of the Trinity, such as was the outcome of later theological controversy. The Logos doctrine occupied all his attention; and the doctrine of the ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \iota o \nu \pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ had to wait for its formulation by later theologians.

## Angels and demons.

It is scarcely disputable that St Paul, following the common Jewish view of his time, believed in a hierarchy of angels, though in the Epistle to the Colossians he makes a protest against angelolatry. In the Church of the second century the belief in angels was quite general ; but Justin's Apologies say very little concerning them. He mentions in i 33,5 the angel of the Annunciation, and asserts in ii 6 (7), 5 that the angels were endowed with free-will. In ii 4 (5), 2 he states that the government of the world had been entrusted by God to angels, but that these had been unfaithful to their trust. He does not speak of prayers to or invocations
of angels, but in i 6,2 he states that the Christians reverence and worship ( $\sigma \epsilon \beta \circ \rho \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каі $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ) the Father, the Son, the angels, and the prophetic Spirit. The bearing of this passage upon the subject of Justin's view of the Holy Spirit has been already considered ${ }^{1}$. As regards the mention of the angels, it seems a natural, though not an inevitable interpretation, that Justin is giving to them a place in ordinary Christian worship; and the worship of angels was not unknown in certain districts of early Christendom ${ }^{2}$. At the same time the expression is, as has been said, careless and unscientific; and it is scarcely to be supposed that Justin put the angels upon a plane at all level with that of the Father and the Logos, nor probably with that of the Spirit.

Justin has not an elaborate demonology, as Origen has; but a theory of demons is fundamental in him,.as in most of the Church Fathers. It cannot be ascertained whether Justin derived his views on the subject from the demonology of Plutarch and the philosophical schools of his time. At least we may be sure that his conception of $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$ would not have appeared singular to any contemporary thinker. All the evil in the world is ascribed to their agency. Their work is a general opposition to the Logos and all His works (i 10, 6: ii 8,2 ), their object is to enslave men to evil and falsehood (i 14, I : 58, 3: ii 4 (5), 4: 9, 4). They were responsible for the heathen mythology (i 5,2 ), and the idols were copies of their shapes (i 9, 1). They had tried to forestall the New Testament and the rites of the Church (i $23,3: 62: 64: 66,4$ ), though their attempts

[^16]often showed an entire misunderstanding of the true meaning of the Old Testament prophecies (i 54). They had caused the human sufferings of Christ (i 44, 12); and they were the authors of calumny and violence against the Christians (i 10, 6: 23, 3: 57, I: ii 1,2 : 13, I), the opponents of Christian knowledge (i 44, 12), the instigators of heretics (i $26: 56: 58$ ). They would undergo eternal punishment (i 28, 1). This is not the place to enter upon a full discussion of demonology in general or of Justin's views in particular. It is sufficient to notice that the theory of the Apologies possesses a primitive crudity ; but it is quite in line with the contemporary theory of the cause of evil, and it is a natural outcome of the views which are set forward in the Old Testament (perhaps under Oriental and Greek influences), and in the uncanonical literature such as the book of Enoch, and which were current in New Testament times.

Justin occasionally distinguishes between the evil angels and the demons. Thus in ii 4 (5), 2 he adopts the view that the angels fell by unnatural union with women, and that their offspring were the demons ${ }^{1}$. Similarly in ii 6 (7), I the same distinction is drawn. But usually the term $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$ seems to include all the powers of evil. In the only reference in the Apologies to Satan, the Serpent, or the Devil (i28, i), he is called the leader of the evil demons.

## Ethics and Eschatology.

Though Justin was much interested in the moral power and results of Christianity (i 14, 2: ii 10, 8), yet he gives no systematic theory of Christian ethics

[^17]in the Apologies, nor, as might be expected, does he touch on such delicate subjects as the morality of slavery. His chief ethical doctrine is that of human free-will (i 10, 4: 28, 3: 43: 44, II: ii $6(7), 3$ ), which he attempts to reconcile with the belief in God's foreknowledge (i 43). Ethically considered, Christ's work is to effect a conversion of the will, to supplement free-will by imparting a bias towards good (i 6I, IO). Thus we are saved $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \epsilon \tau a \nu o i ́ a s ~(i 28,2)$, and Gehenna is the punishment of immorality and unbelief in Christ's teaching (i 19,8 ); Christian faith results in goodness of life (i 65, I : 66, I: ii 3 (4), 2). Isolated details of conduct are touched upon; e.g. marriage and continence in i 15: 29; divorce in i 15,5 : ii 2,5 ; the exposure of children in i 27: 29; obedience to constituted authority in i 17 . Suicide is condemned in ii 3 (4). The passage in ii 12,2 has been taken to imply a certain sympathy with the self-advertising desire for martyrdom, but it seems too vague to justify such an inference. It probably refers only to the public profession of Christian faith or the public championship of Christians, which entailed capital punishment. Justin does not attribute any special merit to virginity. In i 15, 6 ä $\theta$ Өopoı may mean 'virgins' (though it may simply mean 'chaste,' which would probably include legally married people), but even so virginity is not exalted to a higher position than wedlock.

Justin's eschatology is no more scientifically expounded than his ethical views. He believes that souls will possess perception after death (i 18, 2: 20, 4: 52,3 ), and states that men will rise with the same bodies as they had on earth (i 8, 5: 18,6:19, 4:52,3). His language is quite uncritical, but, so far as it goes, it scems to express a belicf in the resurrection of the
natural body. Any theorizing on the subject would however have been quite out of place in the Apologies. After the Resurrection comes the judgment (i I 2, I: I7, 4: 44, I I). The good will inherit eternal life and become indestructible and free from pain (i $8,2: 10,2: 12,2$ : $21,6: 52,3$ ), the wicked will suffer the pains of fire (i $44,5: 19,8$ ). This fire seems to be quite materially understood, and to be connected with the eventual conflagration of the world (i 20, 4:57, I: ii 6 (7), I). No definition of eternity or eternal punishment is attempted, but it is stated to be an aicuía кó $\lambda a \sigma \iota \varsigma$, and not merely punishment for a period of a thousand years (i $8,4: 45$, 6 ), the $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ is aicovıov (i $2 \mathrm{I}, 6$ etc.), and the punishment will last $\tau o ̀ \nu a ̉ \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu \tau o \nu ~ a i ̂ \omega \nu v a ~(i 28, ~ I) . ~ I t ~ i s ~ a l s o ~ h i n t e d ~$ that there will be no possibility of repentance after the judgment (i 28, $2: 40,7$ ).

## Justin and the N.T. Canon ${ }^{1}$.

In Justin's time there was no fixed Canon of the New Testament, corresponding to that of the Old Testament. That there were Christian writings in existence is of course unquestionable, but the Church had not as yet compiled an official list of the books which best embodied its tradition. The process of selection of the fittest was not yet completed or approaching completion, and no doubt there were in use many Christian books (and probably many orally transmitted narratives) which varied both in text and in subject-matter from the books which eventually were

[^18]included in the Canon. It is quite possible that Justin was acquainted with such writings; but there are very few passages in the Apologies that give any clear indications of such an acquaintance. As a rule they are more naturally susceptible of a different explanation. (See notes on the separate passages i $16,5: 35,6: 50$, 12: $60,3: 61,4,9$.) There can be little question that Justin was acquainted with the chief books of the New Testament. Though he nowhere mentions St Paul, he must have known most of his epistles ; for not only do many passages in his works justify the supposition (see Index of Scripture quotations), but also the fact that he engaged in controversy with Marcion makes it incredible that he had not studied the Pauline literature. So far as the Synoptic Gospels are concerned, Justin quotes freely from them (though less, so far as can be traced, from St Mark than from the two others) in the Apologies; and he speaks of the $\dot{a} \pi о \mu \nu \eta \mu о \nu \in \dot{u} \mu a \tau a ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi о \sigma \tau \dot{\partial} \lambda \omega \nu$, à ка入єìtaь єن̇ay $\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \iota^{1} a^{1}$ in i 66,3 , and states that they were read at the Eucharistic meetings (i 67,3 ). It seems impossible that these 'memoirs' should be any other than the Synoptic Gospels, from which Justin cites with such frequency, though it is not incredible that other writings, which did not at last obtain a place in the Canon, were still used in the public services of Churches in some places. Justin nowhere calls these writings inspired or quotes them as from God or the Spirit, and he supports the credibility of the New Testament by pointing to its accord with Old Testament prophecy (i 33,5 ) ; but he had no doubts of the Divine mission of the Apostles (i 39, 3: 50, 12), and he calls the Christian documents 'our writings' (i 28, 1). Their

[^19]liturgical use, alternative to or in company with the use of the prophetic Scriptures (i 67,3 ), would naturally produce, or be produced by, a belief in their inspiration.

Justin is, like most ancient authors, very careless in quotation. He misquotes, adapts, introduces glosses, combines passages, to suit his requirements; many of his variations from the text of the New Testament can also be explained as sheer lapses of memory, or as due to a variant text or to a divergence of oral tradition, or as influenced by a liturgical formula which differed from the Biblical text. But such phenomena are very frequent in ancient literature, and afford no proof that Justin possessed no text of the Synoptic Gospels. They appear similarly in his quotations from the Old Testament ${ }^{1}$ and from classical authors ${ }^{2}$.

The question whether he was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel can scarcely be answered with any certainty. The passages in $\mathrm{i} 6,2: 35,6: 52,12: 60$, 3 suggest reminiscences of that Gospel, but the inference in their case is exceedingly doubtful (see notes). In i I 4, 5 he says that Christ's sayings were $\beta \rho a \chi$ єis каi би́vто ноь, which seems scarcely true of the teaching in the Fourth Gospel, and Veil argues therefore that Justin could not have known that Gospel. The argument however is not entirely convincing. Justin might have special reasons for quoting only from the Synoptists in his Apologies ${ }^{3}$.

[^20]And it would be quite possible to argue that even in the Fourth Gospel the teaching, though more continuous than it is in the Synoptic Gospels, is yet essentially gnomic in character. The passage in i 6I, 4, 5 seems to be an unquestionable, though inexact, citation from John iii 3-5 (see note ad loc.), but it is not outside the bounds of possibility that the phrase was a common formula in use at baptisms. If, leaving isolated passages, we turn to consider the Logos doctrine of Justin, we are met by a similar uncertainty. The phraseology, in which that doctrine is stated, is Johannine, and yet the underlying idea is not quite that of the Fourth Gospel. Furthermore it is quite possible that Justin is only expressing and developing views which had become the common property of the Church, or which were based upon the current philosophical teaching of the schools ${ }^{1}$. It cannot be confidently affirmed that Justin's theory must have been derived from a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel. When all the evidence is accumulated, the balance of probability may seem to incline in the direction of supposing that Justin was acquainted with this Gospel, but the supposition must be made tentatively, and the possibility of alternative explanations must be admitted.

## The Sacraments.

The Apologies give very little evidence for the system of Church organization with which Justin was acquainted. There is no mention of presbyters, and it is not stated whether the 'president' (o $\pi \rho o e \sigma \tau \omega$ 's

[^21]i $65,3: 67,4$ ) at the Eucharistic service is a temporary or a regular official. But the 'deacons' of $\mathrm{i} 65,5: 67,5$ certainly seem to be permanent ministers. Justin however gives us exceedingly valuable descriptions of the Baptismal and Eucharistic services, and his account deserves detailed consideration.

Holy Baptism. No formulated creed is quoted, though it is not inconceivable that fragments of some such creed are found in i 13, 3: 2I, I: 31, 7; and it is admitted that the Roman Church had a Greek baptismal creed by the year I50. Nor is any definite allusion made to the custom of Infant Baptism. The passage in i 15,6 is often quoted as being such an allusion ${ }^{1}$, but it can, by itself, hardly be pressed to bear such a meaning. Oí '่к $\pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu a \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ is far too vague a phrase to be invoked as definite evidence for the practice of Infant Baptism, though it is not hereby implied that the practice did not exist. But Justin's detailed description in i 6I is obviously meant to refer to the baptism of converts. So far as the form of administration is concerned, the following points should be noted; it is preceded by instruction, profession of faith $(\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota)$, and promise of obedience, by prayer and fasting in company with the converts' Christian instructors (2) ; the baptism is administered in the threefold Name (3, IO, 13), and Justin seems to speak only of immersion, using regularly the term 'bath' in reference to $i t^{2}$; nothing is said as to the person by whom the sacrament was administered, and it is not stated to be the privilege of any official person to perform the rite (cf. IO) ; after baptism the baptized person is introduced to the assembly of brethren, prayer

## ${ }^{1}$ E.g. in Gibson $X X X I X$ Articles. Article 27.

${ }^{2}$ Whereas the Didaché (c. 7) allows affusion, where immersion is impossible.
is offered, and the worshippers kiss one another; the celebration of the Eucharist follows (i $6_{5}, \mathrm{I}-3$ ). There is no mention of unction, or signing with the cross, or imposition of hands (though some suggest that the last ceremony may be implied in the mention of the prayers after baptism, and the coming to the $\pi \rho \rho \in \sigma \tau \omega$ 's very naturally falls in with this view ${ }^{1}$ ) ; and it is not made clear whether the kiss is the last baptismal or the first Eucharistic action. Warren (Ante-Nicene Liturgy p. 61) points out that in the Clementine liturgy the kiss of peace occurs at the beginning, as well as just before the offertory.

Justin's doctrine of the Sacrament is very simply stated, without any technical discussion of the various questions of later controversy. His statements may be summed up as follows: Baptism is firstly the completion of conversion (i $6 \mathrm{I}, 2$ ), involving self-dedication ( I ), public profession, repentance (2), and conscious recognition of a new ideal (i 65, 1). Secondly it is regeneration (i 61, 3, 10) and the beginning of a new life (кalvotoıך $\theta$ év $\epsilon \in$, i 61,1 ). Those born in sin, the

 $\operatorname{sins}$ (i 6I, 2, IO). Fourthly it is an 'illumination' (i 6I, 12), the seal of the enlightenment of those who have been taught the Christian faith. But Justin does not discuss in the Apologies the question whether the sacrament is merely symbolical or actually efficacious. His language is quite naive and untechnical, and could hardly have been otherwise in the conditions under which the Apologies were written, addressed as they are to heathen readers, and for the purpose of showing that the Christian rites are at any rate harmless.

[^22]The Eucharist. We have two descriptions of this service in the Apologies, one (i 65 ) giving the procedure after the baptism of converts, perhaps the Easter celebration, the other (i67) describing the ordinary Sunday Eucharist. The reasons for the observance of Sunday are stated in i 67,8 ; they are that on this day God dispelled darkness and created the world, and Christ rose from the dead ; there is no allusion to the Fourth Commandment.

The outline of the service is as follows: A reading from the 'memoirs' of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets is given (i 67,3 : this is the first reference to the liturgical use of Christian writings); the president delivers a homily (ib. 4); all stand up and pray in common (though no formulae of prayer are cited); then bread, wine, and water are brought to the president, who delivers over them a prayer (obviously not from a book), to which the congregation responds Amen (i 65, 3:67, 5); then the elements are distributed to the worshippers, and taken to the absent by the deacons (i $65,5: 67,5$ ); the free-will offerings are presented to the president, who uses them to help those who are in need (i 67,6 ). This service is restricted to those who believe and have been baptized, and are living good lives (i 66, I) ; but Justin specifies no distinction between a missa catechumenorum and a missa fidelizm. There is no mention of the use of the words of institution, though they are quoted in i 66,3 ; nor are the words of administration given. Furthermore there is no mention of singing or of a benediction; though these ceremonies may have been in use at the time ${ }^{1}$.
${ }_{1}$ Thus the antiphonal singing of the Christians is mentioned by Pliny Ep. x 96 and a formula of blessing is given in the Apostolic Constitutions. Cf. Warren op. cit. p. 3 ro.

The carrying of the elements to the absent does not involve Reservation in the modern sense, nor is it suggested that the absent were only absent on grounds of sickness. It is perhaps a case of coincident administration; or possibly the worshippers reserved for later use all or part of that which they received, and the absent similarly reserved for a convenient opportunity the consecrated elements brought to them ${ }^{1}$.

It is difficult to discover the precise nature of Justin's views on the Eucharistic sacrament, so far as they are stated in the Apologies; and it seems to be a mistake to extract the dogmatic theories of later Sacramentalism from his vague and unscientific language. It is obvious that he regarded the Eucharist primarily as a service of praise (cf. i 13,2 : 10,1 ), a sacrifice ${ }^{2}$ of praise and thanksgiving ; his term for the elements is ci Xapıбтía (i 66, 1 ). And so he lays more stress upon it as an opportunity for corporate thanksgiving than as a memorial of Christ's death, a mystery, or a sacrament, or a social meal ${ }^{3}$. The crucial passage, in which he attempts to define the nature of the elements after consecration, is i 66,2 ; and unfortunately the language of that passage is extraordinarily obscure, and admits of various interpretations. According to Otto's view, it means 'Just as by the word of God Christ became flesh, so by the word of prayer proceeding from Him the food is made the body and blood of the Incarnate Christ.' The 'word of prayer' is supposed by some to mean the Lord's Prayer ${ }^{4}$, which may have been thus used in the

[^23]Eucharist; Otto takes it to refer to Christ's words of institution, whilst Bishop Gore ${ }^{1}$ admits that 'any form of benediction of the elements, believed by the Church to be substantially what Christ used, or any form of prayer repeating His words of institution, would answer sufficiently to Justin's description.' This is also Donaldson's view ${ }^{2}$, though he translates $\delta i$ ' $\epsilon \mathfrak{v} \chi \hat{\eta} s$ дójou ' by the prayer of reason,' i.e. any Christian prayer.

Another interpretation ${ }^{3}$ of the words, however, takes $\lambda$ óyou as objective genitive; 'by prayer to (i.e. invocation of) the Logos which comes from God' (which may be identified with the Holy Spirit, cf. i 33, 6). This is a possible construction, for we find $\epsilon \dot{v} \chi a i \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ in classical Greek (cf. Luke vi 12). And it is perhaps impossible to decide which of the two renderings is the more plausible. In either case the phrase refers to the consecration of the elements by prayer. (See note $a d$ loc.)

But what does Justin mean when he says that from these consecrated elements aiцa каi ба́ркєs катà $\mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\beta o \lambda \eta ̀ \nu \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi о \nu \tau a \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ? The phrase has been taken to involve Transubstantiation in the fullest sense, but it is very dangerous to draw such definite inferences from the words of Justin. The general idea certainly seems to be that of a mysterious change in the elements, whereby they become more than коьдòs ă $\rho \tau о$ or коьдò то́ $\mu$. And this change is compared to the Incarnation. Just as the Divine word effected the union of Divine and human in Christ, so the word of consecration effects a similar union in the elements. And this consecrated food operates upon our human nature (аîда каi о́а́ркєs is used in that general meaning, just as ба́рка каi аîдa

[^24]has been used of the nature which Christ assumed) $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\mu \in \tau a \beta o \lambda \eta^{\prime} \nu$, i.e. by process of assimilation. It seems obvious that Justin's language expresses a confused notion of Sacramental grace. The physical operation and the spiritual operation are both present in his thought, but he is not yet quite clear as to their relation. He explains the Eucharist by the Incarnation ; Christ became incarnate by the Word of God ; so His incarnate nature is imparted in the Eucharist. But it is very doubtful whether he fully understood his own language. There is the germ of a Sacramental theory in his words, and his language may be taken to foreshadow later developments of such theory; but the time was not yet ripe for a full discussion of the methods by which Sacramental grace operated upon the recipient of the consecrated elements. Justin plainly believed that the bread and wine became Christ's body and blood, and by assimilation nourished the recipients ; but it is very questionable whether he had considered the method of that change or the meaning of the 'assimilation' of which he speaks. He was, however, clearly convinced that the power of Christ's incarnate life was, through the medium of the consecrated elements, conveyed to the recipients, and he does not seem to have realized that the method of this communication was a point of difficulty, needing elucidation.

It has been suggested that the mention of wine as one of the Eucharistic elements is a later interpolation in Justin's works, and that he only knew of the use of bread and water. Harnack', after emending oivoy to üvov in i 54,6 , Tryph. 69, argues that there is no other mention of wine in Justin except in Apol. i 65: 67. He

[^25]points out that in i 66 Justin does not quote the passage ' I will not drink of the fruit of the vine'; further, that

 very suspicious, and that the words каi кра́натоs are absent in Cod. Ottob.; that therefore кра́датоs is to be regarded as a later correction for v̋סatos, which eventually got incorporated into the text. He then proceeds to excise the mention of wine in i $65,4: 67,5$, pointing out also that in the reference to the Mithras-cult in i 66, 4 water alone is spoken of. He thus arrives at the conclusion that the early Church used indifferently water or wine in the Eucharist, and attached the promise not to the specific elements but to the general act of eating and drinking in Christ's name. This theory is highly ingenious; but it seems dangerous thus to controvert the universal Church tradition, whereby bread and wine were regarded as the characteristic elements of the Eucharistic celebration. And Harnack's methods of dealing with the MS text are uncomfortably drastic. The references to the use of wine are too plain and simple to be thus ruthlessly deleted. The phrase $\begin{gathered} \\ \delta a \\ \text { atos }\end{gathered}$ каi кра́натоs is no doubt strange; but is it likely that the scribe, who ex hypothesi first corrupted the text into this form, would not have been conscious of its singularity? It is equally possible that Justin makes such special and repeated mention of water in order to refute the popular charge of drunkenness. The analogy of the Mithras-cult proves nothing. Justin has already pointed out that many anticipations of Christian usage showed plainly the ignorance of the demons who prompted them; and this might seem to him but another example of the same fact. The omissions of Cod. Ottob. are so numerous that it can scarcely be taken as a sufficiently authoritative guide in this matter. Nor can
much be inferred from Justin's omission to quote the passage referring to the 'fruit of the vine.' He might have quoted it, but he was under no necessity to do so. On the whole it may therefore be said that Harnack's arguments are more ingenious than convincing. Nor even is the emendation of oîvov to o้vov to be accepted without hesitation ${ }^{1}$.

## III. The number of the Apologies.

So far the Apologies, which we possess, have been spoken of in the plural number. But it is now necessary to discuss the question whether they are not really one single Apology. On this question authorities are divided in opinion. Thus Krüger ${ }^{2}$ declares that there are no grounds to suppose that these two Apologies were originally one. Cramer ${ }^{3}$ agrees with this view, but supposes them to have been united before the time of Eusebius. Harnack ${ }^{4}$ believes them to have been one, the second being an appendix to the first, and thinks it probable that Justin never wrote a second Apology, and that Eusebius, who says that he did, was attributing the work of Athenagoras to Justin. Similarly Bardenhewer ${ }^{5}$ points out that there is no evidence in later literature for another Apology by Justin. Finally Veil ${ }^{6}$ holds the extreme view that the two Apologies were always and organically one.-The external evidence is derived

[^26]entirely from Eusebius. (The mSS place the second
 Euscbius tells us ${ }^{1}$ that Justin wrote $\lambda$ óyous $\dot{a} \pi$ onoyíav éXoytas, addressed to Antoninus Pius and the Senate ; again ${ }^{2}$, that he wrote a $\lambda$ óros to Pius and his sons and the Senate, and a second $\dot{a} \pi$ oдoría to Antoninus Verus; again ${ }^{3}$, that he addressed a $\delta \in u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ \beta \iota \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$ to Aurelius and L. Verus. These statements are by themselves somewhat vague and discrepant. But the confusion becomes worse, when we proceed to examine Eusebius' quotations from the Apologies. Thus in ii I3 he quotes Apol. i 26 as found $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ ' A \nu \tau \omega \nu i ̀ \nu o \nu ~ a ̉ \pi o-~$
 $\dot{a} \pi 0 \lambda o \gamma_{i} a$, , but immediately afterwards quotes ii 12 as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega}$; in iv 16 he quotes ii 8 (3) as $\operatorname{\epsilon in}^{\prime} \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu \eta$ $\dot{a} \pi o \lambda o \gamma i \dot{a}$, which might mean the first Apology or the
 iv 17 he quotes ii 2 as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o \tau \in ́ \rho a \dot{a} \pi \pi o \lambda o y i ́ a . ~$.

The inference seems obvious, that Eusebius' evidence is wholly untrustworthy. Perhaps he derived his quotations merely from a book of excerpts. But it is noteworthy that none of his quotations (with the doubtful exception of that in iv 16 ) is stated to come from the second Apology, and also that his statements in iv 16 and 18 as to the persons, to whom the second Apology was addressed, are almost certainly incorrect.-When we turn to the internal evidence of the Apologies themselves, we are faced with difficulties connected with the text. Thus in three passages of the second Apology there are references back to the first ${ }^{4}$; but Krüger

[^27]supposes two of these, and possibly all three, to be later glosses, and Cramer suggests that they were inserted by the man who put the two Apologies together. It is however a perilous habit to be too ready to discover glosses. Similarly the text in i i is doubtful; but at least it seems clear from i 3, 2 that the first Apology is addressed especially to a pious Caesar and to a philosophic Caesar ; and the same seems to be the case with the second Apology (ii 2,16 : 15,5 ). Finally it is possible to maintain that the opening of the second Apology is strangely abrupt ${ }^{1}$, taking as it does the tone of an appeal to the Romans, whereas later the Apology is seen to be addressed to the Caesars. No doubt a certain amount of rhetorical licence might be allowed to Justin; but it seems incredible that in a formal document, addressed to the heads of the Roman State, he should begin in the tone of the opening words of ii I.The internal evidence is thus seen to be somewhat deficient in amount and strength ${ }^{2}$. And it is possible that complete agreement upon the point at issue will never be reached. But to the present writer it appears that the cumulative effect of the internal evidence, conjoined with the phenomena of Eusebius' quotations, and with a general feeling as to the line of argument pursued in the work, inclines the scale towards a belief in the unity of the two Apologies. It is possible that they were not originally one, and that the second Apology was added as an Appendix, when the event recorded in ii 2 occurred to excite Justin to a renewed effort; and that he then took the opportunity to answer certain

[^28]objections and to round off his arguments. This may be the explanation of the confusion visible in Eusebius' quotations. But it seems quite improbable that the two Apologies, which we possess, were wholly separate works. The probability in favour of the contrary view seems so strong that in the present edition the two have been printed as one continuous treatise. The disruption of the two may be explained as due to accident, or to the fact that the second was a later Appendix to the first ; the two editions (of the first separately, and of the first and second together) might have co-existed and thus caused confusion.

## Date of composition.

The date, at which this work was composed, is a matter of dispute. The question rests entirely upon internal evidence, and in order to understand the bearing of that evidence it is essential to be acquainted with the facts of Imperial adoptions under the Antonine Emperors.-In A.D. I 36 Hadrian adopted L. Ceionius Commodus Verus and gave to him the name of Caesar ; he thus became L. Aelius Verus Caesar. He died in A.D. 138 and Hadrian adopted T. Aurelius Fulvus Boionius Antoninus (later known as Antoninus Pius); at Hadrian's command Antoninus adopted M. Annius Verus or Verissimus, born A.D. 12I (who thus became M. Aurelius Antoninus), and the son of L. Verus, born A.D. I30, who thus became L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus. On Hadrian's death in I 38 Antoninus Pius became Emperor. In I 39 M. Aurelius was given the title of Caesar, and he became co-regent in 147. L. Verus was received into the Senate in $153^{1}$. In I6I Pius died and

[^29]M. Aurelius became Emperor; he immediately made L. Verus Augustus and Princeps, i.e. fully equal to himself. In 162 L . Verus departed to the Parthian war.

If now we turn to the dedication of the 'first' Apology (i I), we find that it is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, to his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, son of Caesar (i.e. of L. Aelius Verus Caesar) and adopted son of Pius. The text is probably corrupt. Thus viç by itself seems suspicious, and the insertion of $\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ before it would be an improvement. Some also would insert Kaíoapı with Oúnрıббi $\mu \varphi$, or insert Kaíбapı after Avitoкрáторı

 (omitting the subsequent comma) is also possible, as Spartian ${ }^{1}$ tells us that Lucius' father was eruditus in litteris. Veil suggests that the word $\phi \iota \lambda \circ \sigma$ ó $\phi o v$ (if accepted) is a mistaken gloss to designate Aurelius, L. Verus being confused with L. Commodus, Aurelius' own son. None, however, of these emendations affects the evidence as to the date, except the suggested insertion of Kaíapı.

At first glance it certainly seems as if the date must be taken to be 138/139, on the simple ground that Aurelius is called Verissimus, a name which he ceased to bear on his adoption, and is not called Caesar, a title which he received in I 39. This evidence appears decisive to various authors ${ }^{2}$. And, though the omission of the title Caesar might certainly be due to textual corruption ${ }^{3}$, it may be admitted that the name Verissimus

[^30]is not such as could readily be supposed to be a later insertion, nor is it very probable that Justin was wrong in his nomenclature for the rulers whom he was addressing. At the same time it is fair to remark that the name Verissimus is in itself a species of nickname, such as might have clung to Aurelius all through life, as the epithet Pius clung to Antoninus.

And there are certain difficulties in the way of accepting this early date. Too much should not be made of the fact that in 139 Aurelius was only I8, and Lucius 9 years old, and therefore that the title of 'philosopher' is scarcely fitting to them. For we hear of Aurelius ${ }^{1}$ that philosophiae operam uehementer dedit et quidem adhuc puer. Nam duodecimum annum ingressus habitum philosophi sumpsit. Thus Lucius might be called philosophus even at the age of 9 (a point which does not need making, if $\phi \iota \lambda \sigma \sigma o ́ \phi o v$ be the right reading). But it is worth remarking that L. Verus was not taken into the Senate till 153 , and yet is here addressed as if he were in public position and authority.

Hence many authors ${ }^{2}$ prefer to favour a later date than I 39 for the composition of the first Apology, and certain other passages agree with that theory. Thus in i 26 Justin says that he has already written a $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \tau a \gamma \mu a$ against Marcion. The chronology of the Marcionite heresy is very uncertain, but it seems probable that Marcion came to Rome circ. A.D. I39. At first he was an orthodox Christian ; and he stood forward as an independent heresiarch only after some time, i.e. perhaps circ. A.D. I44. And Justin's words attest the fact that he had attained some influence. Again in i 29, 3 the mention of Felix

[^31]naturally leads to the supposition that hereby is meant C. Munatius Felix, who, according to a papyrus, was prefect of Egypt A.D. 148-154. So too in i 46, I Justin tells us that he is writing about 150 years after Christ. No doubt that number is a round one, but it need not be entirely vague; and, if we adopt the chronology of St Luke, we should again have $147-154$ as the date of the first Apology.

There are therefore many indications which favour the later date ; and, apart from the use of Oì $\boldsymbol{O} \ell \sigma \sigma i \mu \omega$ in i I , there is nothing which conflicts with that date. It is true that in i 31, 6 Justin refers to the revolt of Barcochba as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \varphi$ ) $\pi o \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \varphi$ (the revolt having taken place in A.D. I32-I35). But it is clear that his use of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is quite loose. Thus in i 29,4 he uses it with regard to Antinous, who was drowned A.D. I 30 ; in i 42,4 he speaks of Christ as having been crucified $\kappa a \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma$, and in $\mathrm{i} 6_{3}, 16$ of Christ's advent as having been $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. Thus also in Tryph. I and 9 (which was written after the Apology, for he refers to it in c. 120) he speaks of the Judaic wars as only just over.

If the two Apologies are really one, they were probably (though not necessarily, if the second was an Appendix) written at the same or nearly the same time. And we find in ii I, I that the events narrated in ii 2 took place when Urbicus was prefect of the city. He is known to have held that office from A.D. 144-160. It has however been supposed, on the authority of Eusebius ${ }^{1}$, that the second Apology was addressed to Aurelius and L. Verus. But the internal evidence scems clearly against this view. Thus in ii 2,16 it seems inevitable to suppose that the reference is to Pius and

[^32]Aurelius. It is certainly strange that Verus should not be mentioned; but here again there is some insecurity of text, and Valesius, in his edition of Eusebius, suggests
 $\pi a i \delta i$, which Harnack and Schwartz accept. A more definite point is found in ii 2,8 , which presupposes the existence of only one autocrat, whereas in Aurelius' reign there were two Augusti. These arguments can be answered; thus Ruinart and Otto, arguing for a date in Aurelius' reign, point out that Verus might have been absent at the Parthian war, to which he went in A.D. 162, and that therefore there would only have been one autocrat in Rome ; again they suggest that Urbicus may have held office in Rome twice, and that the $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \grave{\eta} s$ à̀токрátшр of ii 2,16 might be Aurelius (in which case the 'philosophic son of Caesar' of the same passage would have to be Commodus, who was not born till A.D. 161). But these arguments are obviously unconvincing, and Eusebius' statement is scarcely worth the trouble of defending. It seems inevitable to believe that the second Apology was written in Pius' reign, and probably after 152, for Crescens, according to Eusebius, did not become influential till that date, and in Apol. ii $8(3)$ he is represented as a dangerous enemy to Justin. The balance of evidence seems to be in favour of uniting the two Apologies ; and the internal evidence of the first Apology is mainly on the side of a date about A.D. I 50153. The only alternative is to place the date of the first Apology about A.D. I39; in which case the second must have been written many years after the first, though even so there would be no impossibility in the way of supposing that Justin re-published the first, with the second added as an Appendix. But the bulk of the evidence is almost irreconcilable with the theory of so
early a date as A.D. I 39 for the first, and any date in Aurelius' reign for the second Apology. Nearly every indication is in the direction of bringing the dates of their composition closer to one another, and fixing them in a period very near to the year 153.

## IV. MSS.

The text of the Apologies principally depends upon one MS, Codex Regius Parisinus CDL, of the year A.D. 1364, in the National Library at Paris. It contains, besides other works, the Dialogue with Trypho and the Apologies, the so-called second Apology preceding the first. This text has been suspected of containing deliberate interpolations, as well as casual mistakes or additions; but it is our only guide of authority. This MS is symbolized in this edition, as in Otto's, by the letter A.

The Codex Claromontanus ( $L X X X I I$ ) or Fenwickiamus (noted as B in Otto), of the year A.D. 1541 , is an inferior copy of A, and is very seldom of any use for the correction of the text. It contains the Dialogue and the Apologies in the same order as A. According to Otto, this ms came into the possession of the Rev. J. A. Fenwick, of Cheltenham, in 1872.

Codex Ottobonianus graecus CCLXXIV, of the 15th century, containing Apology i 65-67, seems to represent a different tradition to that of A, but is very faulty. (Rome, Vatican Library.)

Codex Parisinus supplementi graeci CXC, of the 17th century, contains excerpts. (Paris. National Library.)

Besides these, two MSS, Codex Ambrosianus H. $14^{2}$ infer. (Milan) of the year 1564, and Codex Monacensis

CXXXII (Royal Library, Munich) of the year 1565, contain in Latin version i 65-67. Occasional help for the establishment of the text is also derived from the quotations in Eusebius Hist. Eccl.; the text of these has been taken from the edition of E. Schwartz (Leipzig, 1908). The quotations in John of Damascus' Sacra Parallela are valueless for critical purposes; they are collected in K. Holl Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela.
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## Analysis of the Apologies.

i I-5. Introductory. I claim for the Christians justice and a fair trial. The mere name of Christian is not a sufficient ground of punishment; it is the conduct of Christians that should be investigated. The ordinary procedure against us is due to the influence of the demons, who have always been opposed to the Logos.

6-12. Examination of popular complaints against the Christians. (a) Atheism. We are not atheists (6); some of us may indeed be malefactors, and if so, should be punished as such (7). Our doctrine has analogies with that of Plato (8). True, we do not worship idols (9), nor offer material oblations (IO), but we believe in a God who desires moral conduct on the part of men. (b) Treason. The kingdom we look forward to is not one of this world. We are obedient to your authority (II), and are really your best allies in the cause of peace and virtue ( 12 ).

## 13-67. Explanation of Christianity.

(a) The Christian faith is perfectly rational (I3), and produces purity of life (14), in obedience to Christ's injunctions ( $15-17$ ), and in accordance with our belief in immortality (18, 19). And this belief has its parallels in heathen writings (20), even as our doctrine of Christ is not dissimilar to, though it is more moral than, heathen mythology (21). But we believe Christ to be the Son of God in a unique way (22). The truth of this shall now be proved (23).
(b) i. Christianity alone is true. For the Christians alone are persecuted (24), and yet persist in their faith (25). Even heretical Christians suffer immunity (26), and therefore it is plain that the opposition to us is the work of the demons. Moreover our lives are pure (27-29).
ii. Christ is really the Son of God. This is proved by the fulfilment of prophecy (30-53).
iii. The disbelief in Christ is due to the demons, who attempted to forestall His coming by propagating heathen myths $(54,55)$, and since that time have instigated magicians and heretics (56-58). Other antici-
pations of Christian doctrines can be found in the philosophers, who borrowed their ideas from the Bible (59, 60).
(c) The Christian cultus must be described, viz. Baptism (6I), a rite which has also been anticipated by the demons (62) [Cap. 63 is a digression], as they anticipated other Christian ideas (64), and the Eucharist (65-67).

68-ii 2. Appeal. I claim fair treatment. Hadrian's rescript shows that this would be no reversal of previous policy (68). And the necessity for such an appeal is proved by the persecutions of Christians at the hands of the demons' tools (ii I), of which I can give you a recent example (2).

3 (4)-9. I may briefly answer certain objections: (a) Why Christians may not commit suicide, and must not deny their faith (3). (b) Why God allows persecution. It is due to the abuse of free-will by fallen angels (4), and the only power which enables men to use their freewill rightly is the power of Christ (5). But God's final judgment on life will come in time (6). All champions of righteousness have been persecuted (7), and I am anticipating a similar fate (8). (c) The doctrine of Divine retribution is not degrading, but true and moral (9).

IO. Simmary. The superiority of Christian doctrine is due to the very nature of Christ.

II-I 3. Personal challenge. We do not fear death (II), and this shows the nobility of our belief (I2), and our right to take a pride in it (I3).

14, I5. Conclusion.

## Differences from Krigger＇s text．

| page | line |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 8 |
| 16 | 13 |
| 40 | 1 |
| 40 | 2 |
| 42 | 10 |
| 43 | 7 |
| 43 | 12 |


| 47 | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47 | 14 | бıà фóßou |
| 57 | 16 | வ่то̀ тоט̂ |
| 58 | 6 | ámò $\tau 0 \hat{\mathrm{v}}$ |
| 66 | 8 | àmò $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ |
| 73 | 9 | Х $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\nu} \quad \pi a \rho a \gamma \in \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ ， $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \in \nu b \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ |
| 76 | 15 |  |
| 85 | 1 | $\theta$ ¢òs |
| 91 | 4 | $\gamma \in \nu o \mu e ́ \nu o u s$ |
| 92 | 6 | $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega ิ \nu \omega^{\nu} \nu$ |
| 105 | 8 | $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \in \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ |
| 106 | 16 |  |
| 107 | 7 | $\alpha \nu \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \in \nu$ |
| 107 | 12 | ［ $\delta \nu$ Oй́pßıкоs є̇ко入d́бато］ |
| 107 | 15 | ［ $\epsilon$ is $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \quad \epsilon \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \delta \nu \tau \alpha \quad \tau \dot{\nu}$ Птолє $\mu \alpha i ̂ o \nu]$ |
| 107 | 17 | $\epsilon l$ aủtd тоûto $\mu$ ¢́vov |
| 108 | 3 | סıסабка入єiov |
| 109 | 4 | MS Caps．3－8 |
| 118 | 14 |  |
| 120 | 13 | סıà rov̂ тò $\lambda$ ． |
| 124 | 12 |  |

## K．

$\pi \rho о \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \in \in \nu \tau a s$
oủ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ $\delta \iota a ̀ . . . \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu, \epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ है $\mu$ а 0 ov
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \rho a \phi a i ̂ s$
öт $\tau$ रà $\rho$ oủ
$\bar{\epsilon} \nu \in \rho \gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha i$
$\pi \epsilon \pi$ оіךкє
 фı入обठфоıs тò ध́ $\pi \iota \kappa a \lambda o u ́-$
 коเข $\delta \nu$ é $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$

$\delta \iota a ̀ \phi b \beta o \nu$


а́ $\pi \dot{\delta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi$ ov той
$\mathbf{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu, \pi a \rho a \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \nu \mu \epsilon \nu$
$\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$
$\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega \mu \notin \nu$ ous
$\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega ิ \nu[\dot{u} \pi \dot{\delta} \rho] \dot{\omega} \nu$
$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
є̇ $\pi \epsilon \iota$
aं $\nu \alpha \delta \epsilon \delta \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon$

入є $\mu$ аîo
aủtò toûto $\mu$ óvov，el

MS Caps．4－8， 3
om．
$\delta \iota \dot{a} \tau \grave{\lambda} \lambda$ ．
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i \omega \nu$

## TO؟ AГІO؟ IO؟ミTINO؟ ФІАОЕOФОণ KAI  MPO乏 ANTRNINON TON EYミEBH．











 $8 \stackrel{\omega}{\nu}$ Otto om A Eus

1．Dedication．See Intr．p．xlvii．
4．＇$\rho a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha!\delta$.$] ＇lover of letters．＇$ Cf．2，2．In Plato we find $\epsilon \rho a \sigma \tau \grave{\eta}$ $\nu \circ \hat{u}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta s, \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \grave{o}$ ка入òv，$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ бoфíq．Mat $\delta \in\{a$ is the Platonic word for mental culture and accomplish－ ments，fairly equivalent to the Latin humanitas．
ib．iєpप̆ $\tau \in \quad \sigma v \gamma$ ．］Cf．Cic．de Divin． $112{ }^{6}$ sanctus Senatus．＇Also in Verg．Aen．i 426 ．Juv．xi 29 has ＇sacri Senatus．＇Justin repeats the phrase i 56,2 ，ii $2,16$.

5．éк тaytòs $\gamma$ tevous］possibly ＇hated by every race＇（cf．Matt．x 22 ，and for a similar use of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ Thuc．iii 69）；but far more probably ＇out of every race，＇alluding to the wide spread of Christianity．Cf． Tryph．52，131，Ap．i 25， 1 ．

6．$\mu ル \sigma o u \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu \quad \kappa$ ．$̇ \pi \eta \eta \rho$ ．］Cf． Luke vi 27， 28 ；Ep．ad Diogn． 5.

7．Прібкои ктл．］．The father＇s name is Latin，the grandfather＇s is Greek．Flavia Neapolis was near the old Sichem，and was organized as a Greek city in A．D．70；now called Nablous．The Roman pro－ vince lost its name of Judaea after the rebellion in Hadrian＇s reign and was officially called Syria Palaestina． This was the old name found in Herodotus $\Sigma v \rho i \eta \dot{\eta} \Pi a \lambda a \iota \sigma \tau i v \eta$ i 105 ， ii 106，iii 9r，iv 39．The article with $\Pi a \lambda a \iota \sigma \tau i \nu \eta$ is sometimes omitted on coins of Neapolis，ac－ cording to Otto．

8．$\alpha v ่ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］i．e．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \tau \sigma \circ v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．

9．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu \kappa a l$ ยै $\nu \tau \epsilon \cup \xi \iota \nu]$ The





 $\kappa a ̂ \nu ~ Ө a ́ \nu a \tau о s ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon ı \lambda \eta ̂ \tau a \iota, ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \delta i ́ к а \iota a ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu ~$

 Іо $\delta є i ́ a \varsigma, ~ a ̀ к о v ́ \epsilon \tau \epsilon ~ \pi а \nu \tau а \chi о \hat{v} \cdot ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \delta є ̀ ~ к а i ̀ ~ i ́ \pi a ́ \rho \chi є \tau \epsilon, ~ \delta \epsilon \iota \chi \theta \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau а \iota . ~$ 3. oủ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \kappa о \lambda a \kappa \epsilon v ́ \sigma о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \dot{v} \mu a ̂ s ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \gamma \rho а \mu \mu a ́-~$




 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \hat{\lambda} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{A}$
former word is used meaning 'an address,' Lat. oratio. "Evтevदıs is a technical word for a 'petition.' It is found in Böckh's C. I., 2829. II. (See Liddell and Scott.)
2. Do not be led astray by bad precedent, prejudice, rumour, or superstition to prefer anything to truth. Be true to your reputation. We ask for a fair and diligent examination; do not condemn yourselves by refusing it. We at any rate can suffer no hurt, even if you kill us, unless we be proved to be evildoers.
2. $\delta \lambda$ obros] 'reason' in general, the sense of right, feeling for truth. A Platonic use. It is caught up by $\delta \sigma \omega ̈ \phi \rho \omega \nu \lambda$. just below.
3. Tapaıтounévous] The word means 'to excuse oneself, decline.' Cf. Luke xiv 18, and, with infinitive, Heb. xii 19, Acts xxv 11.
5. $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu \lambda \sigma \gamma$.] Cf. $\dot{\alpha} \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s$ $\lambda$ óros in 3, I. The distinction between the two adjectives is not
very definite. The phrase here could be Latinized into sana ratio and the second phrase into uera ratio.
ib. е̇к пavzòs $\tau \rho o ́ \pi$.] The phrase is found in Xen. An. iii 1, 43 and elsewhere.
6. $\pi \rho \delta$ ] 'in preference to,' Lat. prae. For a similar sentiment cf. Plat. AD. 28 B. -
 sentence is pleonastic; 'you have the reputation that you are called.' It is tempting to excise these two words as a gloss or to alter them so as (1) aroil the pleonasm. Olto suggests ofoa instead of oûv, but does not admit the conjecture into his text.
12. $\pi$ pòs $\chi$ ápıv oulı.] ' speaking to win your favour.'
14. $\mu \eta$ ท $\pi \rho 0 \lambda \eta \dot{\psi} \psi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'asking you to judge us, not with prejudice,nor in obedience to a desire of pleasing the superstitious, not with unreasonable impetuosity, nor by (reference to) the popular disfavour


 т८ какòv $\delta \dot{v} \nu а \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \lambda \in \lambda о \gamma і \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a$, ท̀v $\mu \grave{\eta}$ какіая є́pүа́та»
 $\mu \epsilon ̀ v \nu \dot{v} v a \sigma \theta \epsilon, \beta \lambda a ́ \psi a \iota ~ \delta$ o ov̉.








 Bellios Otto
which has for a long time prejudiced our case; for so you will be condemning yourselves.' A somewhat slipshod sentence even if (as is not certain) all the datives depend on катехо $\mu$ èvous. The change from $\mu \eta \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ to $\hat{\eta}$ suggests that $\dot{\dot{\delta} \rho \mu \hat{\eta} \text { and }}$ $\phi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$ should be taken with $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho o \nu \tau a s$. ПрокатÉx $\omega$ means 'to preoccupy' and so literally here 'which has preoccupied your minds, or the public mind.' The idea in $\tau \eta^{\nu}$ $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ ह́aut $\omega \hat{\nu} \psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \nu$ фépovtas is a favourite one with Justin (e.g. c. 3, I ; 4, 2). Cf. also Plat. $A p .30 \mathrm{c}$.
3: $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \alpha ́ \rho] ~ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ justifies $\kappa \alpha \theta$ ' $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$. 'The sentence will be against yourselves, not us; for we cannot be hurt.'
4. $\left.\eta_{\nu} \mu \dot{\gamma}\right]$ Cf. I Pet. iv 15 .
5. ḋтоктеìval] Cf. Plat. loc. cit.
3. We ask for a fair inquiry and agree to punishment, if any charges are proved against us. But if we are guiltless, it is irrational to punish us; if you judge from passion, you are wronging your-
selves. As subjects should be able to account for their lives, so rulers should obey the dictates of piety and philosophy; this is for the public good and is in accordance with old maxims. So we must explain our case; you must listen and judge fairly.
8. au่t $\omega \nu$ ] i.e. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau L a \nu \omega ิ \nu . ~$ ' $\mathbf{E} \xi \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \oint \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ and $\kappa 0 \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ are both passive ; with the latter word aủooús would strictly be required.
9. $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ обєєкии́шขтаи] Note the plural verb with a neuter plural subject; an exceptional use, generally found with nouns denoting persons.
ro. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ $\delta e ̀$ ko $\lambda$.] It may conceivably be intended to mean 'we would feel called upon to punish ourselves.' But the phrase seems dubious; it probably comes from the $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ éautoús below, to which some one has added ko入áseıv as an explanation.
14. $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ à $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ érád.] Otto translates lites intendere, 'to set up proceedings.' Cf. ėтdं $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \delta \grave{\kappa \eta \nu,}$

$$
1-2
$$

2．ка入خ̀v $\delta є ̀ \kappa a i ̀ \mu o ́ \nu \eta \nu ~ \delta i ́ \kappa a \iota a \nu ~ \pi \rho о к к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu ~ т а и ́ т \eta \nu ~ \pi a ̂ s ~ o ́ ~$














aitian Dem．277，12；275， 4 ； $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ érá $\gamma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ id．1256， 11 ． Otto cites Xen．Mem．ii 9， $\mathbf{1}$ ； Joseph．Antiq．xiv 10， 7 ；I Cor． vi 1．It is perhaps more simple to translate＇to bring on us the trouble we mention＇（this being the force of $\tau \dot{a}$ ），referring to divaitious doıкєiv．Cf．the common phrases
 oúvous．

1．$\pi \rho o ́ k \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu]$ ．a legal challenge．＇ חро́бк入ทбis means＇a judicial sum－ mons or cilation．＇

2．єن̉ $\theta \dot{v} \nu \eta \nu$ ］A legal word mean－ ing strictly＇an examination of ac－ counts＇at the expiration of a term of office．So єv̉əúvєı $(4,6)$ means ＇to audit accounts，to call to account．＇

3．入ó $o \mathrm{ov}]$＇doctrine．＇Thus we have later $\beta$ lov кai $\mu a \theta \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$

ib．${ }^{2} \lambda \eta \pi \tau o \nu$＇not to be laid hold of，＇and so here＇offering no handle for reproof．＇The comparative is used in the sense of＇impregnable，＇ Thuc．i $37,143$.

4．єن̇бє $\beta$ eíq кal фi入．］used with special reference to the description of Antoninus and Marcus．

7．$\stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］An inaccurate reminiscence of Plat．Rep． 473 D，E，
 $\tau a i ̂ s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ ท̂ ol $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \eta$ ท̂s．．．$\phi \iota \lambda o \sigma 0^{-}$
 hear（Capit．Marc．27）that one of Aurelius＇favourite maxims was ＇florere ciuitates si aut philosophi imperarent aut imperatores philoso－ pharentur．＇

10．$\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The idea is that it would be the Christians＇own fault if they allowed people to remain in ignorance of the principles of the Christian religion，and so suffered； if they did not speak for themselves， they were morally responsible for the injustice committed against them． The ms text is impossible．Otto＇s reading gives excellent sense． He translates $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho$ by corum causa＇on account of them．＇But its sense here perhaps is rather＇in place of．＇（So Veil has an Stelle dever．This sense is not unknown or uncommon in Attic．See Liddell and Scott．） The sentence is not thoroughlylucid， but can be translated＇so that we may not－in place of those who live


 є́ррїкє








in the habit of ignorance) of our life and doctrines-bring on ourselves the punishment for the errors they commit in blindness,' i.e. ' if we do not enlighten them, we shall suffer in their place, on their behalf; for we shall be accountable for their ignorance.' A good principle of missionary enterprise.
2. L's alpeî 入ó $\gamma$.] 'it stands to reason.' The phrase is common in Herodotus.
3. àvaто入ó $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ оу ктл.] 'When once you have learnt the truth, if you do not act justly, you will have no excuse for the future before God.' The impersonal turn of the sentence is distinctly curious.
4. A name by itself is insignificant; it is the conduct accompanying it which matters. You punish others for proved ill-deeds, but us merely for our name. Perhaps some of us are evildoers, but it is unfair to treat us all on an equality. All philosophers have not the same theories, and some live very unworthily; some also teach atheism or degrade the moral character of the gods; and yet you do not punish them.
5. іvómaтos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. I Pet. iv 14-16: Tert. Apol. 2 'illud solum expectatur quod odio publico necessarium est, confessio nominis non examinatio criminis.' Here is the regular distinction between the nomen ipsum and the flagitia cohaerentia nomini, about which Pliny had in-
quired in his famous letter to Trajan (x 96). Trajan (ib. 97) had replied 'Conquirendi non sunt; si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt, ita tamen ut qui negauerit se Christianum esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est supplicando diis nostris, quamuis suspectus in praeteritum, ueniam ex paenitentia impetret. Sine auctore uero propositi libelli in nullo crimine locum habere debent.' Tertullian $A p .2$ criticises this ' O sententiam necessitate confusam; negat inquirendos ut innocentes et mandat puniri ut nocentes.' This criticism is unfair. It was the ordinary Roman procedure to require an accuser ; the Christians were not conquirendi, because they were not malefactors, and so inquisition for them by the State was unnecessary. But if they were accused and refused to abjure their faith, they were to be punished as Christians, i.e. for the mere name. Pius on the whole followed Trajan's policy.
8. хрךбто́татоו] It is hardly necessary to point out that Justin knew the real meaning of Christ's name. Cf. ii 5 (6), 3. The play upon words here is such as the ancients were fond of. It seems to have been made possible by popular mispronunciation of the word. Cf. Suet. Claud. 25 'impulsore Chresto' (unless the Chrestus there named is some other person than Christ). Lact. iv 7, 5 'ex-
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 ขทтає．7．ồ үà т то́тоу тара入аßóvтєऽ тועє̀s тарà

 $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ Sacr Par ib｜｜ 16 Tis $\dot{j} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$ Otto rı $\dot{o} \mu 0 \lambda$ A
ponenda huius nominis ratio est propter ignorantium errorem qui eum immutata littera Chrestum solent dicere．＇Tert．ad Nat． 3 ＇A uobis Chrestiani pronuntiamur， nam ne nominis quidem ipsius liquido certi estis．＇

3．mo入ıteiav］ratio vitae ciuilis． Cf．Dem．399， 6 ots É $\sigma \tau^{\prime}$ év 入órocs $\dot{\eta}$ $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon=q u i$ in oratione uersantur． Pautigny neatly translates here＇$S$＇il est prouvé que notre genre de vie n＇est pas plus coupable que notre nom．＇

4．á $\gamma \omega \nu \iota \hat{a} \sigma \alpha l]$ A strong word， ＇to be exceedingly anxious＇；perhaps it might be rendered in Latin by
laborare．
7．Ėváperov］＇virtuous．＇
9．＇ $\left.\begin{array}{l}\phi \\ \text {＇} \\ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \\ \nu\end{array}\right]$ probably not＇in your presence＇（though that is a possible rendering），but＇in relation to yourselves，＇i．e．non－Christians， parallel to the subsequent＇$\epsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ＇in relation to $u s$ ．＇

16．$\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \circ \lambda o \gamma i a \nu] \quad \mathrm{Cf}$ ．the vivacious passage in Tert．$A p .2$.

17．єúӨúvєเข］Cf．note on єúӨúvn 3， 2 。

19．тара入аßóvтєs кт入．］Cf．Matt．
x 33 where dpveîo $\begin{aligned} & \text { al } \text { is used；in }\end{aligned}$ Mark viii 38，Luke ix 26 we find є́ $\pi \alpha \iota \sigma \chi$ र́vєб $\theta a \iota$ ．





8．oủk ỏp $\theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{S} \mu$ 立 $\nu$


 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta o \gamma \mu a \tau i \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi a \lambda a \iota \omega ิ \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ évì ỏ $\nu o ́ \mu a \tau \iota ~ \pi \rho o \sigma a-$









courage one another＇to follow Christ； or，better，passive＇are encouraged，＇ as the omission of an object after тарак．（if middle）is harsh．
1．каки̂s $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ A general statement，perhaps with a special reference to the immoral Christian sects of the time，such as the Carpocratians．

2．ä入入 1 s］＇anyhow，＇alioquin （Otto），auch ohnedem（Veil）．
ib．ката入є́ $\gamma \in \iota \nu$ ］properly＇to tell at length，reckon up．＂Here it seems used as equivalent to ka and takes a genit．of the person accused，and an accus．of the crime alleged．

5．ن่ $\pi$ or $\mathcal{\epsilon} \epsilon \epsilon \omega \mathrm{\sigma}$ ］properly＇promise，＇ so here＇profession．＇Cf．ijtcoxpou－ $\mu \hat{e} \nu \omega \nu$ in 5 ，I．＇ETa ${ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\hat{E}} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ occurs in the same sense，e．g．in I Tim． ii 10 ．

8．di $\theta \in \dot{6} \neq \eta T a]$ Under the early Empire Epicureanism and Cynicism grew in influence，especially among the educated，though the populace still preserved much of its old religious feeling．In the and century the educated classes underwent a reaction towards religion，reaching
often to childish and fanatical super－ stition．Of this reaction Fronto and Plutarch are striking instances； Lucian and Galen are exceptions． ＇A $\theta \in$ б́t $\eta$ s was one of the main charges brought against the Christians．

9．$\Delta \dot{i} a \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \hat{\eta}]$ Cf．the strictures of Heraclitus，Xenophanes，and Plato．

II．oi $\left.\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \chi^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu_{0}\right]$＇those who attend to，pursue，follow after．＇

12．roúrous］i．e．Zeus and his children．

5．You are really urged on by evil demons，who in ages past com－ mitted abominations and frightened men into calling them gods，each with a special name．Socrates tried to recall men from this belief，but the demons procured his death；and similarly they are causing us too to be attacked as atheists and impious． Tust as Socrates，by $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$, refuted the belief in the so－called gods，so the ＾óros incarnate in Christ teaches us that these are evil demons．

13．$\tau i$ ò $\mathrm{n}_{\text {ouv }} k \tau \lambda$ ．］A rhetorical question．＇Why should this be？ what is the meaning of it？＇
ib．＇$\phi \phi$＇$\dot{\mu} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ ］＇in our case．＇


 ఢоעтєऽ．2．єiрŋ́ $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon ́ s . ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \epsilon i ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi a \lambda a \iota o ̀ \nu ~$
 є́ $\mu о i ́ \chi \epsilon v \sigma a \nu \kappa а i ̀ ~ \pi а i ̂ \delta a s ~ \delta \iota \epsilon ́ \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho a \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ ф о ́ ß \eta т \rho a ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ т о \iota s ~$ є́ $\delta \epsilon \iota \xi a \nu, ~ \grave{\varrho} \varsigma \kappa а \tau a \pi \lambda a \gamma \eta ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ \varsigma ~ o ̂ ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi ~ \tau a ̀ \varsigma ~ \gamma \iota \nu o \mu \epsilon ́ v a s ~$










[^33]1．$\delta 0 \xi \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota]$＇to hold an opinion＇； so occasionally in Plato．
ib．oर крiбєєs $\epsilon \xi \epsilon \tau$ ．］＇you do not investigate disputes．＇This sense of кploıs is a direct derivative from крірєбөą．Cf．Plat．Rep． 379 E， where commentators cite in com－ parison Pind．Olymp．vii 80 крtб七s $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\theta} \theta \lambda o r s$ and Nem．x $23 \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \hat{\theta} \theta \lambda \omega \nu$ крібн．Cf．also Plato Legg．876в


2．$\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \iota \delta a \iota \mu$ ．］Justin＇s demon－ ology is treated Inlrod．p．xxx．

3．－akpitws］＇without trial．＇Cf． Dion．Halic．xi 43 áкрітшs ámoктєl－ $\nu \in L$ ．

5．ė $\pi \iota \phi a v \epsilon[\alpha s]$ The reference here is to the Greek myths，which Justin seems to accept as true records of daemonic manifestations，perhaps combined with Genesis vi．

7．Tou＇s ot］A rare，mainly Ionic， use of the definite article．Cf．Tryph． 47 тà $\partial \circ \sigma a, 67 \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ö $\sigma a$ ．

10．$\delta \nu \delta \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] \quad Cf．$ ii $_{4}(5), 6$ where the fallen angels are repre－ sented as having given names to themselves and their children the demons．

II．इぃкра́тクs］Harnack（Reden und Aufsätze，Socrates und die alte Kirche）points out that Justin，in his reverence for Socrates，set an example which the later Greek apologists， with the exception of Theophilus， generally followed．They regarded Christianity not as $a$ ，but as the religion，and so treated the con－ demnation of Christians as a con－ tinuation of Socrates＇condemnation． Christianity was superior to Socra－ ticism in purity，universality，compre－ hensibility，power；Socrates was only a tool of the Logos，whereas Christ was the Logos；but Socrates was on the side of Christ，because he was on the side of truth．

15．кaıvd $\epsilon l \sigma \phi . \delta \alpha \iota \mu$ ．］One of the




 $\phi a \mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ̀$ какоѝs каì à $\nu о \sigma i o v s ~ \delta a i ́ \mu о \nu а \varsigma, ~ o i ̀ ~ о и ̉ \delta \grave{~} \tau$ тоîs










formal charges in Socrates' indictment. Cf. Xen. Mem. i i, Plat. Ap. 24 B.
r. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ " $\left.E \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma_{i}\right]$ év is not indispensable to the grammar, but the parallelism with èv $\beta a p \beta \dot{\text { ápois }}$ perhaps justifies its insertion.
2. ímo $\lambda$ órov] A hint of the Spermatic Logos. See Introd. p. xxii.
ib. Ėv Rapßápos] This is the usual opposition between Greeks and non-Greeks. Cf. i 7, 3; 46, 3 . See also Tat. Or. i $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi a \nu \nu \quad \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \rho \omega \mathrm{~A}$


5. op $\rho$ oús] Braun insists that oaimoves in the Church fathers is always used in a bad sense, that therefore $\delta \rho \theta$ ov's $\delta a l \mu o v a s$ is an impossible expression here, and that $\theta$ єoús must be substituted for $\dot{\text { on }} \rho$ oús. Braun's generalization may apply to later fathers, but Justin's use seems less definite; sometimes he uses סaluoves by itself for the evil demons (cf. à áá $\epsilon \iota \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \alpha \mu \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ just above), sometimes he joins adjectives to the word, which, if his use were constant, would be
otiose (cf. סaimoves фav̂dot above, какои's סaluovas i 23,3 ). In this context the reminiscence of Socrates (whose $\delta a u \mu$ हैvov Justin would doubtless have in mind and recognize as ó $\rho \theta$ óv $)$ would influence Justin's use of the word.
6. We are called atheists, because we do not worship such immoral gods. But we worship and revere the true God, father of all virtues, and His Son who came from Him and taught us our belief, the angels His followers, and the prophetic Spirit.
9. $\left.\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \cdot \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \theta \epsilon 0 \iota\right]$ A grammatical genitive of separation.
 with evil,' 'purum a uitiositate' (Otto). Another genitive of separation.
13. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha]$ The reference is general, to the body of Christian truth.
ib. $\tau \delta \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \nu \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'The$ army of angels also, who follow Him and are like Him.' T $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ is probably used in the idiomatic sense of 'also.' This passage seems to put the angels, if not on an equality


 àфӨóvตs тараסıסóvтєя.

## 5

 бау какоиิруоь.


I $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ v$ A $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o ́ v$ Keil alii || $8 \pi \rho o \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau a s$ Perion Maran $\pi \rho o \lambda \in \chi \theta$ év $\boldsymbol{\pi} a \mathrm{a}$ A Otto
with Christ, at any rate in precedence to the Holy Spirit. In consequence hopeless efforts have been made to take $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ v$ as the object of $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \xi a \nu \tau a$, either parallel to in $\hat{a} s$ ('who taught us, and laught the angels'), or parallel to rav̂ra ('who tausht us these beliefs, and (the belief in) the army of angels'). The emendation orpar $\eta$ 万óv is intended to avoid the difficulty by transferring the reference to Christ as the 'chief of the angels.' See Intr. p. xxviii. 'E $\xi_{0} \mu o \neq \nu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ seems to imply the view that the angels are advancing towards a fuller likeness to Christ. No doubt the reason why Justin mentions the angels here is because of the foregoing passage about good and bad demons.
2. 入ó $\gamma \varphi$ каl $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta$. т $\iota$.] Cf. John iv $24, \mathrm{v}_{23}$.
4. $\pi a p a \delta \delta \delta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s]$ The object may be $\dot{\omega}$ s $\epsilon \delta \delta \delta a ́ \chi \theta \eta \mu \in \nu$, used substantivally as equivalent to $\mu \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\delta \iota \delta a \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. So Otto, but the construction may be quite normal-sc. éкєî̀b̀ $\tau \in \kappa \tau \lambda$.
7. Some Christians have been condemined as malefactors; but that is no reason why all Christians should be condemned. All Christians have not the same views, any more than all philosophers have. You must differentiate, and punish wrongdoers as such, and not as Christians.
8. $\delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau . \pi \rho o \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \alpha s]$ Otto retains the ms $\pi \rho o \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ and explains it 'you condemn many Christians for their crimes, but not by reason of those $I$ have mentioned (viz. sincere Christians)' i.e. they who do no wrong are not the cause of the condemnation of others ; bad Christians are condemned for their lives and not for their Christianity; therefore it is not the name that matters. The explanation is unconvincing. 'You do not condemn criminal Christians by reason of true Christians' is not equivalent to 'you do not condemn criminal Christians because their Christianity is the same as that of true Christians.' Nor is it easy to find a preceding passage to which roùs $\pi \rho \circ \lambda \in \chi \theta \in \downarrow \tau \pi a s$ might plainly refer. The emendation $\pi \rho \rho \in \lambda \in \gamma \chi \theta \in \nu \tau a s$ makes excellent sense and the argument of the passage becomes simple and intelligible. 'Some Christians, you say, have been condemned as malefactors. True; but you often condemn many people, when at any time you inquire into the lives of those who are being accused (the reference of $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o u ́ s$ is thus general, and not to Christians specially), but you do not do so because others have been con demined before. (Therefore the fact that some Christians have been condemned is no reason for condemning all Christians.) As a general fact





 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa а \tau а \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ن́ $\mu i ̂ \nu \tau a ̀ \varsigma \pi \rho a ́ \xi \in \iota \varsigma \kappa \rho i \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$







 $\kappa a \theta a \rho o \hat{v}$ ßíov є́ $\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \circ \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} ~ \tau o \hat{v} ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho \gamma o v ̂ ~ \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta ̂ s ~ a ̀ \nu \tau \iota \pi o \iota o v ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$, кai $\sigma \pi \epsilon v$ v-
we allow that "Christian" is a generic name applied to different people. (You must therefore differentiate.)'
 nomine Otto. I can find no other example of this use; but ס̀à $\pi a \nu \tau \partial े s$ ( $=$ altogether) occurs in classical Greek. Cf. є̇к $\pi$. т чо́тои above, 2,1 .
4. $̇ \nu \beta a \rho \beta a ́ \rho o \iota s]$ Cf.i 5, 4. The argument from the analogy of philosophy has been alluded to in c. 4. See Introd. p. xiv.
5. тो '̇тเкатךүорои́ $\mu \in \nu \circ \nu]$ 'the name which is made a charge against them' (so Otto) or 'the name applied to them' (Maran). Cf. c. 26, 6.
10. oú $\gamma$ à $\rho$ roùs кат $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma . \kappa \tau \lambda$.] There may be a reference to the concluding phrase of Hadrian's rescript, quoted by Justin at the end of c. 68.
8. We defend ourselves in order to save you from error, and because we will not utter falsehood; for we desire the eternal life with God, and
believe that to confess our faith is a sign that we follow God and desire to be with Him. This teaching of Christ has analogies in some of Plato's doctrines. You may think it absurd; but, if it is a mistake, it hurts only ourselves, so long as we do no wrong.
13. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \mu \omega ิ \nu]$ Cf. Plat. Apol.
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda a \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota$ є $\xi \sqcap \mu \alpha \dot{\rho} \tau \eta \tau \epsilon$.
14. '่̇ '申' $\eta \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ] 'in our power.'

1 \%. Snuıoup rov̂] 'Maker,' a Platonic word; cf. Plat. Rep. 530 A . In neo-Platonic language it means the fabricator $\epsilon \xi \xi{ }^{\circ} \nu \tau \tau \omega \nu$, as opposed to $\kappa \tau i \sigma \tau \eta s$, the Creator $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi$ oủk $\delta \nu \tau \tau \omega \nu$. In the Gnostic systems the Demiurge was the maker of the world and either the power opposed to God or a rebellious servant. Neither the neo-Platonic nor the Gnostic implications of the word can fairly be read into Justin's use of it.
ib. àvtıtoเov́ $\mu \epsilon \theta a]$ 'We seek after,
 $\tau v \chi \in i ̂ \nu ~ \tau о v ่ \tau \omega \nu ~ \delta u ́ \nu a \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \delta i ́ ~ \epsilon ै \rho \gamma \omega \nu ~ \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma a \nu \tau a \varsigma, ~$




 є̀ $\lambda$ Өóvtas ${ }^{\circ}$ j̀ $\mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \delta є ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a v ̉ т o ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ́ ~ ф а \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \gamma є \nu \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, ~$






15 9．I．＇A $\lambda \lambda$＇ои’ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \theta v \sigma i ́ a \iota \varsigma ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda a i ̂ s ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi \lambda о к а і ̂ \varsigma ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$






9 кả̀ toîs aủroîs Otto кai r．a．A \｜ 12 фウ́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota s \kappa \tau \lambda$ Thirlb фウ́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota s$

exirt ourselves for the life with God．＇ $\Delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ absolutely or $\delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \beta l o v$ is a Platonic phrase，equivalent to ratio uitae．

4．¿̀vtırvteî］＇resists，opposes．＇
6．II $\lambda a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ］For Rhadamanthys and Minos cf．Gorg． 523 E．For the Хi入ıovtaєт $\grave{s} \pi \epsilon$ piooos cf．also Phaedr． 249 A．

9．кả้ тoîs aủtoîs кт入．］With
 as a genitive absolute．
 concerns us and nobody else．＇For similar statements cf．Tert．Apol．38， Arnob，adu．Nat．ii 53，Athenag． Suppl． 36.

9．We do not worship idols，for they are merely images representing demons in shape and name．God＇s form is not so；His ineffable likeness cannot be copied in destructible articles which need man＇s care．And the very men who make these articles and are their guardians are im－ moral．Cf．Isaiah xliv 9－17，Acts xvii 24,25 ．

18．Өєой цорфウи้］Cf．Phil．ii 6.
 some say is fashioned to His honour？ or for the purpose of worship．

20．$\epsilon \kappa \epsilon l \nu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi$ ．］refers to c． 5 above．
 $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \epsilon i \delta o ́ \sigma \iota \nu$ vi $\mu i ̂ \nu \lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ \grave{a} \tau \eta ̀ \nu$ vै $\lambda \eta \nu$ oi $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \hat{\imath} \tau a \iota \delta \iota a \tau \iota \theta \in ́ a \sigma \iota$




 фӨартоі̂s каі ठєонє́voıs Өєраттєías тра́үнабьข є่торона́-



 $\lambda a ́ \sigma t o u s ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho о \sigma к v \nu \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~$



 $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \circ \rho a ̂ \varsigma ~ \pi a \rho \epsilon i \lambda \eta ́ \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ тòv $\theta \epsilon o ́ \nu$, aủтòv тaрє́ $\chi о \nu \tau a$ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ o ́ p \omega ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma . ~ \epsilon ่ \kappa \epsilon i ́ v o u s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \delta e ́ \chi є \sigma \theta a \iota ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~$
 $\epsilon i \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ Thalem Otto $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{~A}$ (et infr) $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ Stephan
2. $\dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\nu} \backslash \eta \nu]$ a double accusative. 'What workmen fashion their material into, by planing and cutting and casting and hammering.'
4. $\dot{\alpha} \tau \uparrow \mu \omega \nu \quad \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu]$ Cf. Rom. ix 21.
7. ôs ä́ppŋтоу кт入.] ‘Who, though of ineffable glory and form, yet has His name set upon articles which are corruptible and need to be cared for.' Plato Tim. 28c tells us that God cannot be named. Cf. i 6 r, If ; ii 5 (6), I.
9. á $\sigma \lambda \lambda$ रiis eloi] Cf. Orig. Cels. i 5 .
12. '̇ $\mu \beta \rho o \nu \tau \eta \sigma l a s]$ 'stupidity.' The adjective $\epsilon \mu \beta \rho b \nu \tau \eta \tau$ os is found in classical Greek.
14. $\mu \in \tau a \pi 0 \iota \epsilon i v]$ 'transform.' Ash-
ton suggests $\mu$ орфотогєiv.

10. We do not believe that God requires material oblations, since He gives all; but He receives those who try to be like Him in character. He created the world for men's sake, and those who act worthily in His sight live and reign with Him. We had no choice as to birth, but for the choice of our future we can use the rational powers He has given us. Human lares cannot incline men to do this, but the Divine reason could, were it not opposed by the demons.
18. $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \rho a \hat{s}]$ 'offering' or 'oblation.' It is used in the sense of 'present' in Theophrastus Char. xvii (xxx) ad fin. Cf. Acts xvii 25.
$\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \delta o ́ \gamma \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каi $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каі $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ่ o \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，то̀̀s $\tau \grave{a}$





 $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\jmath} \varsigma \kappa a \tau a \xi \iota \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \quad \pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \in \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} о \nu \tau a \varsigma$ ，


 $\dot{a} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a s ~ к а i ~ \sigma v \nu o v \sigma i ́ a s ~ к а т а \xi ६ \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota . ~ 4 . ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$




I．$\tau \grave{a} \pi \rho o \sigma \delta \nu \tau \alpha \ldots \alpha^{2}$ ．］＇essential good qualities．＇

4．$\theta \in \tau \hat{\psi}]$＇imposed．＇
ib．T $\grave{\nu} \nu$ da $\rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ］probably＇in the beginning＇（as in § 3 infr．），though Braun translates omnino．Cf．i 59， 1.

5．á $\gamma a \theta \delta \nu$ ővтa кт入．］Cf．Plat． $7 i m .29 \mathrm{D}$ ．The apparent dualism of language is found in the Timaeus， but it would be rash to infer that Justin held a theory of the eternity of matter．His point here is merely that God made the world out of matter，which is the common view of philosophers，though Justin adds the Christian touch that it was $\delta i^{\prime}$ $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \pi$ ous．$\quad{ }^{\prime} \mathbf{E} \xi \alpha \mu . \quad 0 \lambda \eta s$ represents Gen．i 2.

6．${ }^{\xi} \xi$ lous］with dative，either ＇worthy in relation to His counsel，＇ or possibly＇show themselves by His counsel worihy＇；cf．$\delta i i^{\top} \nu$ aúròs $\epsilon \delta \omega \rho \eta$ そато кт $\lambda$ ．below．

8．$\sigma v \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ v́ovtas］e．g． 2 Tim．$^{2}$ ii 12 ．

13．$\tau \grave{\partial} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \xi \neq \alpha к о$ ．$\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The sense required is＇We had no choice as to birth，but we have a choice as to
our life．＇Otto translates＇ea uero sectari quae ipsi placent persua－ sionem generat et ad fidem nos ducit＇and compares c． 53,12 ，the idea being that to obey God generates confidence in us about the future．This seems scarcely to be the sense required．Maran translates＇ut sequamur．．．id ipse nobis persuadet et ad fidem nos ad－ ducit＇；i．e．＇God gave us no choice about being born，but He tries to persuade us（He gives us a choice） to do His will，and leads us to faith．＇This is nearer the required sense，but the last clause comes in somewhat clumsily．Veil translates ＇streben wir aber dem nach，was ihm lieb ist，so machen wir（ihn）uns gewogen und gewinnen（sein）Ver． trauen．＇But it seems scarcely possible that eis riotiv dyєt ضuas could mean＇leads us into being trusted by God，＇nor，again，is the needed antithesis thus established． On the other hand cf．8， 2 Tous $\tau \dot{d} \nu$


15．入oүскิ̂v $\delta v \nu d \mu \varepsilon \omega \nu$ ］Note that Justin regards the exercise of free－



 oi фаи̂入o८ $\delta a i ́ \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa а т \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \delta a \sigma a \nu ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \psi \epsilon \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \kappa a i ̀ ~ a ̈ \theta \epsilon a ~ 5 ~$

 $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$.
11. 1. Kai í $\mu \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma, ~ \grave{\kappa} \kappa о v ́ \sigma а \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a \nu ~ \pi р о \sigma \delta o-~$

 گouévovs í $\phi^{\prime}$ í $\mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ ó $\mu o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon i ้ \nu a \iota ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu o u ́ s, ~ \gamma \iota \nu \omega ́-~$
 фаívєтаı. 2. єi $\gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \iota \nu o \nu ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a \nu ~ \pi \rho о \sigma-~$




$$
\text { I } \tau \grave{\partial} \mu \grave{~} \epsilon l \rho \gamma \in \sigma \theta a \iota \text { Sylburg } \tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \eta ̀ \epsilon l \text { A }
$$

will for good as due to the use of the rational powers, i.e. the sanctified reason, which is the sphere of the Divine Logos' operation.

1. ن́m $\epsilon$ p] 'We consider it to be for the benefit of all men.'
2. $\dot{\delta} \lambda$ boros $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] According to Otto this is a reference to the Logos divinus, i.e. Christ. In that case oi d. $\nu 6 \mu 0$ might include the Jewish ) law (Rom. viii 3). But it may rather be a general reference to the Divine $\lambda$ oros in life, of which Christ is the incarnate manifestation. Eipráoaro is conditional in its force, without ä $\nu$.
3. катฑгорэ́мата] This refers to the well-known charges of cannibalism and promiscuity, which were commonly levelled at the Christians. Cf. i 26; 27; ii 12. Tac. Ann. xv 44 'Christianos per flagitia inuisos.' Suet. Nero 16 'Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nouae ac
maleficae.' Eus. Hist. Eccl. v r, 14 .
4. $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ] refers back to кат $\eta \gamma о \rho \eta^{\prime}-$ $\mu a \tau a$.
5. We look forward to a kingdom; but it is not a human one; if it were such, we should deny or conceal our faith, so that we might not lose by death what we hoped for. But our hope is not for this world, and therefore, since death is the lot of all, we care nothing for execution.
6. ákpitcs] ' without exercising judgment,' 'uncritically.' Cf. above, 5, 1. Parallel uses of äкрıтos are quoted by Liddell and Scott.
7. $\gamma เ \nu \omega$ 白 $\kappa 0 \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}]$ ought in strict grammar to be accusative. A similar anacoluthon is found in i $55,6 \delta i$ ' $\hat{\omega} v$ al $\tau \varepsilon \pi \rho b o \delta o t ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ रhlvovtat, $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau \epsilon s$. For the sentiment here expressed cf. John xviii 36 .
8. ávalpoúvt $\omega \nu$ oủ $\pi$.] 'we do not heed our executioners.' A common construction with $\phi \rho o \nu \tau i \xi \omega$.
 $\mu$ évov．

12．I．＇Аршүoì $\delta$＇$\dot{\text { jिì каì } \sigma u ́ \mu \mu a \chi o \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ є i ́ \rho \eta ́ \nu \eta \nu ~}$







 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \tau u ́ \chi o \iota ~ a ̀ \gamma a \theta \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \kappa о \lambda a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ \omega \nu ~ a ̀ \pi \eta \lambda \lambda a \gamma \mu e ́ v o s ~$

 A ov̉ $\gamma$ àp．．．$\epsilon l \delta^{\circ} \delta^{e} \mu a \theta o \nu$ Otto Krüger

Cf．i 39； 57 ，for similar expressions of fearlessness．

I．то仑̂ каl $\pi$ áv $\tau \omega \mathrm{s} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇since death is in any case the debt of nature．＇Similar phrases are found in i 57,2 ；ii 11， 1 ．Otto suggests that Justin may have in mind the common Euripidean phrase кa $\theta a$－ $\nu \in i ̂ v$ ódeìєтat，which occurs for instance in Eur．Alc．419，782， Androm． 1272.

12．We are your allies in the cause of peace．For we teach that no acts can escape the judgment of God．If all men knew this，they would be virtuous；human laws only cause them to conceal their crimes．Are you afraid that crime may cease to exist，and the supply of criminals for you to punish run short？Such a fear is irrational， the inspiration of demons，unbe－ coming to pious and philosophic rulers．But if you still neglect the truth，you may do your worst，but you will not succeed；for rational men will not do what reason forbids． Christ prophesied persecution for us；and His foresight shows His Divinity．

4．és $\epsilon$ ival］A mixed construc－ tion，combining $\dot{\omega}$ s $\varepsilon \sigma \tau i$ and the infinitive without $\dot{\omega} s$ ．It can be paralleled from classical Greek．




 $\tau \nu \nu^{\prime} \xi \xi \in \epsilon \nu$.

5．ท̉ èvápeтoy］It is a little odd to throw this alternative in with simple $\eta$ ．Hence some emend to à $\alpha \iota \rho \epsilon$ é $\eta$ ．
9．$\pi$ गoòs．B入ivov］＇for a little while．＇This use of $\pi \rho \sigma$ s is found in Plutarch and Lucian．
 perly of the damages awarded．

12．ко入aбтทрi（w）］＇punishments．＇
13．of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \delta i d \alpha ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$. ．］The sense is＇men now seek to conceal their crimes because of the lares，and they know they can do so；if they zuere to learn that they cannot evade God， they would not commit crimes．＇ This is a simple and logical state－ ment，and the alteration of the MS oú to of is a trivial change．Otto adopts Maran＇s explanation of the


 بóvov $\pi \rho a \tau \tau o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda \grave{a} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu, \kappa a ̂ \nu ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~$



 5．$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a \delta^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \kappa ~ \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ ф а u ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ ，о̂̆ каì $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$







7 ко入á乡ทтє Sylburg al ко入á̧єтє A ко入д́ $\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ Thirlb
reading which he prefers；＇Justin is showing the superiority of Chris－ tianity to human laws；there is hope of evading the lawes，no hope of evading God．The desire to evade does not show the power of the lawes but their weakness＇；men seek secrecy for crime，not through fear of the laws，but through hope of concealing their crime；take that hope away and crime will cease．？The objections to this argument are（ I ）it is not true to human nature；the normal reason for seeking to conceal crime is fear of the laws；（2）it seems perilously like nonsense to say＇men seek secrecy for crime because they hope they can conceal their crime．＇ The question still remains，why men should trouble about secrecy at all， if it be not for fear of the laws．For the sentiment，Otto cites as parallels Tert．Ap．45，Lact．Inst．v 8.
 because of the impending penalties＇ （if for no more noble reason）．Cf．

$\xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon:$ i 26,7 ；ii 7 （8），r．This limiting use of кäl is elliptical in nature．Cf．Soph．Electr． 1482
 Jebb（Appendix ad loc．）says that ＇in such instances $\kappa a ̈ \nu$ can usually be resolved into каi $\epsilon^{d} \dot{\nu}$ ，with a sub－ junctive verb understood．＇＇So here we may insert $\hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$＇if they be so only because of the penalties．＇


 constructions are thus combined for the sake of variety，though some－ times a faint shade of difference in meaning may be distinguished be－ tween them．

11．$\left.{ }^{\text {is }} \pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu\right]$ c． 5 ．
ib．of $\gamma \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］referring to the epithets of the dedication in c．I．

14．$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ：$\varepsilon \theta \eta$ ］＇the custom，＇i．e．of persecuting Christians．Or it may mean that conservatism was against the novelty of Christianity．

15．Toбov̂тov．．．8бov］i．e，to kill us and no more．Cf．Luke xii 4.




 ő $\sigma a$ ả้ viтa oủ aipท́бєтa८．9．$\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau а ~ \pi \rho о є i ̂ \pi \epsilon, ~$

 ıо à申’ ồ каì тò $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu o i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \pi о \nu о \mu a ́ \zeta є \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \chi \eta ́ к а \mu є \nu . ~$






 $\sigma \nu \nu \tau o ́ \mu \omega \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，vimè $\rho$ то̂ $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \tau о u ̀ \varsigma ~ \phi \iota \lambda a \lambda \eta \prime \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$
 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \mathrm{~A}$

2．ка入入ıєрท＇$\epsilon \tau \epsilon]$＇you zvill pros－ per．
ib．ó $\lambda$ óros］Here undoubtedly Christ．Semisch and Pautigny see a trace of Subordinationism in the
 See Introd．p．xxii．Note that in the next sentence $\dot{\delta}$ vouve $\chi$ そ＇s is iden－ tified as the doer of what $\dot{\delta} \lambda$ oros （reason or Christ）commands．
ib．ои̂ $\beta$ абєл七кढ́татоу кт入．］A genitive of comparison with a super－ lative．This is found in classical Greek with plural words，e．g．Thuc．
 $\nu \omega \nu$ ，where the genitive approxi－ mates to one of class．Here it is probably a symptom of the confusion between comparative and super－ lative，which is a feature of late Greek．Cf．John i． $15 \pi \rho \hat{\rho}$ tof $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ．

5．ن̇фаıpô̂̀тat］＇refugiunt＇Otto． The word means＇to purloin＇and so here，＇to filch oneself azvay from．＇

7．Taûтa］i．e．persecution and its failure．
ib．$\pi \rho \rho \in i \pi \pi \epsilon]$ Cf．Matt．x 26， xxiv 9 ．
9． amborodos $^{2}$ Cf．i 63,5 ，and Heb．iii I ，the only place in the New Testament where the term is applied to Christ．

If．$\forall \theta \in \nu$ кal $\beta$ ．］Cf．Matt．xxiv 25，John xvi 4.

13．$\theta \in o \hat{u}$ ép $\rho o \nu$ ］Cf．Is．xli 22 f ．
17．$\dot{p} \neq 0$, This may be the comparative of $\dot{\rho} \dot{q} \delta o s$, meaning ＇particularly easy＇；or it may be from an erroneous collateral form of $\dot{p} \dot{q} \delta \mathbf{\delta} \boldsymbol{o s}$, found in grammarians．See Liddell and Scott．

18．$\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ］probably in the













neuter sense. 'It is not easy for a soul enchained by ignorance to change quickly, but yet ignorance may be escaped from, if the truth is set over against it.' Quoted by Irenaeus iii 2,3 .
13. We are not atheists, for we worship God the Creator, though not with sacrifices, praising Him and praying to Him. Second to Him we hold Christ in reverence, and the prophetic Spirit in the third place. We shall show that this is perfectly rational.
4. ả $\nu \in \nu \delta \in \hat{\eta}]$ Cf. Acts xvii. 25. Braun cites Clem. Rom. ad Corinth.
 $\dot{\nu} \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \in \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, and other passages. The sentiment is a commonplace in Church writers, and is found in some heathen works, e.g. Eurip. H. F. 1348 deîtal $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ó $\theta \in \grave{s}$ s
 by Braun).
5. $\lambda$ 人 $\gamma \varphi \in \in\{\hat{\eta} s]$ Cf. i $66 \delta \iota^{2}$

6. ' $\epsilon$ ' ' ots $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \phi \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ Some translate 'at all our offerings'; but more probably it is a genuine middle 'for all that we receive.' So again in i 67 , 2. Cf. also Liddell and Scott.
ib. ö $\sigma \eta$ סuvvauss] Cf. i $55 ; 67$.
8. סcaтpoфض̀p] 'sustenance.' $O \dot{v}$ $\pi v \rho i \delta a \pi \alpha \nu a ̂ \nu$ of course refers to the sacrifices.
9. $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \varepsilon \epsilon \nu$ ] 'contribute.' There may be an allusion to the Eucharistic distributions to the poor.
10. Sià $\lambda$ óyou кт $\lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ] Maran translates rationalibus pompis $=a$ reasonable service. $\Delta \dot{a}$ 人órov is better taken as $=$ ' in speech,' cf. i 55,8 ; i 67,4 . $\Pi \circ \mu \pi \eta$ nearly always means 'a solemn procession,' often in connexion with a religious ceremony. In this passage a contrast with the solemnities of heathen ritual is obviously intended. There could scarcely be any Christian processions in Justin's time. The phrase $\pi о \mu \pi \dot{\alpha} s$ каl $\begin{gathered}\text { un } \\ \text { vous should }\end{gathered}$ probably be regarded as zeugmatic; - We celebrate our solemnities, with hymns, in speech' (and not by ceremonial processions). There seems to be an allusion to the Eucharistic service.
11. T $\hat{\omega} \nu$ cis eủp $\omega \sigma \tau\{a, \nu \pi$. $\pi$.] 'all the means of health.'
12. $\pi 0 \iota o \tau \eta ं \tau \omega \nu \gamma \in \nu \omega ิ \nu$ ] the qualities of things.'
13. $\tau 0 \hat{0} \pi \dot{d} \lambda(\nu]$ The genitive is dependent upon air $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$ ts.



 5 хро́voıs Tıßepíov Kaíбapos є́тьтро́тои, viòv av̀тòv то̂̀













5 viòv aủròv Otto al viòv aủrô̂ A || $10 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ Otto al $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \mathrm{A}$
i. $\tau$ is oủ $\dot{\dot{o}} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \lambda 0 \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ] Here at last we get the principal verb, upon which all that preceded, introduced by ws, depends.
5. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \rho \sigma \pi \pi o u]$ The regular Greek equivalent for the Latin procurator. Pilate is called procurator of Judaea, Tac. Ann. xv 44. Luke iii I has
 'Iovoalas, where D and other authorities read émıтрoтé́ovtos, a correction made in order to mark Pilate's office with more precision. (So Plummer, St Luke, note ad loc.)
 p. $x x i i$.
7. $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ 人́rov] 'rationally'; this phrase leads on at once to $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau a v \theta a$
 Probably not 'with the Word,' as it is translated by Bethune-Baker

Early Hist. of Chr. Doctr. p. 199 note 4.
9. 'à $\rho \in \pi \tau \sigma \nu$ ] 'immutable.'
II. $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta\left(\frac{1}{2} \nu\right]$ in the sense of 'mystery,' 'secret above human intelligence.'
14. Do not be deceived by the demons and hindered from reading our pleas. We have shaken off their despotism, and the reformation of our life proves the virtue of our new belief. To show that this is truly what we have learnt and teach, we will quote you some of Christ's sayings.
13. $\pi \rho 0 \delta \iota a \beta \in \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o l$ ] 'previously accused.'
15. ĖvTvXeiv] 'read.' This use of the word is mentioned in Liddell and Scott from Lucian, Plutarch, etc.
ib. नuveival] 2 aor. from $\sigma v \nu i \eta \mu$.




2. oi $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$












## $6 \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega}$ Otto al $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{~A}$

1. $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \omega ิ \nu]$ 'dodges, tricks.'
ib. oúk $\begin{gathered} \\ \epsilon \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \theta^{\prime}$ ' ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$ ] 'plane non' Otto.
2. $\delta \nu \tau \rho \delta \pi$ nov] refers back to

3: $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda 6 \gamma \omega]$ perhaps 'the Divine Logos' ie. Christ.
3. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} T \varphi]$ ] 'unbegotten.' Ashton and others insist that here $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \varphi$ 'uncreated' should be substituted, as also in all similar passages; and that, in like reference, $\gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \eta \sigma \theta a \iota$ should be substituted for $\gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \nu \eta ิ \sigma \theta a$. No doubt the two words could easily be confused in the mss. But Justin might reasonably call God 'unbegotten' in opposition to the heathen myths about Zeus or Jupiter, or to distinguish Him from the Son, who was begotten. Change of the text is therefore scarcely indispensable.
ib. of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \iota{ }^{\kappa} \tau \lambda$.] Here Justin brings forward, as a proof of the power of Christianity, its efficacy in the reformation of individual
character. Cf. ii $6,4$.
4. $\theta \in \hat{̣}$ éautoùs avar.] As Otto says, this seems to have been a regular formula. It recurs in i 25 , 2; 49, 5; 6I, I. Cf. Const. Alost.
 $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \delta i \grave{\alpha}$ rove X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ aủrov̂ $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (the formula for dismissing catechumens after a baptism).
5. Koเv $\boldsymbol{L}$ communism, but general philanthropy.
 (difference in) customs.' Cf. 12, 6.
 i 15,9 .
6. 8 \% ins oi] Masan would delete oi, and Otto suggests aúrol, in order that the reference may be more directly to roves $\mu$ roôvtas. This is attractive but not absolutely necessary. The reference must in any case include tours $\mu$ cooûvtas.
7. vi $\pi \circ \neq \eta \mu \circ \sigma$ vivas] 'suggestions, advice.'
 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \tau v \chi \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~ 4 . ~ i ̌ \nu a ~ \delta є ̀ ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \sigma o \phi i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ v i \mu a ̂ s ~ \delta o ́ \xi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, ỏ $i^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi a \rho ’$ av̉тô $\tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \delta \iota \delta a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$





8. I. Пєрì $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oû̀ $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma u ̛ \nu \eta s$ тобоv̂tov єîTाєע.








 ov่ $\rho a \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \cdot \pi \lambda \eta ̀ \nu$ ov̉ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o ~ \chi \omega \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu . ~ 5 . ~ ढ ゙ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~$

 $\chi \eta \sigma a \nu \mathrm{~A}$
9. $\sigma o \phi i \zeta \in \sigma \theta \alpha l]$ with accusative 'to deceive.' Liddell and Scott quote only two parallels, one from Anth. $P$. xii 25, the other from Aretae. Caus. M. Diut. i 15.
10. $\pi \rho \delta \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s$ aं $\pi o \delta \epsilon[\xi \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon s]$ 'before we embark on our promised demonstration' (c. 13) i.e. that it is reasonable to worship Christ.
11. סvvat $\hat{\nu}$ ] 'Since you have the pozver, it is your duty to find out whether this is in truth our doctrine.'
12. Bpaxeis] See Introd. p. xxxv. 'Nota Sophistarum loquacitas,' Otto.
13. ठи́vauls $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'His zord was the power of God.' Cf. Matt. vii 29, ${ }_{1}$ Cor. 124 .
14. Quotations to show Christ's teaching on chastity, philanthropy, unzorldliness. On Justin's quatations see Introd. p. xxxiv.
15. ©s $\lambda \nu \quad \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \psi \eta$ ] Cf. Matt. v 28.
II. $\varepsilon l \dot{\delta} \delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \delta s]$ Cf. Matt. v 29, 30 ; xviii 9; Mark ix 47. Aíuvion $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ is probably substituted as a Gentile equivalent for $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \nu a \nu$ тои $\pi$ upós.

I5. ôs $\gamma a \mu \in \hat{\imath}]$ Cf. Matt. v 32 ; Luke xvi 18.
16. elol Tives] Cf. Matt. xix 12, II.
20. סiraulas] 'second marriagres.' This might refer to (I) bigamy; (2) successive second marriage,







 $\lambda \in ́ \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ тò àvapi $\theta \mu \eta \tau о \nu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є̇ $\xi$ ảко $\lambda a \sigma i ́ a s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a-$




(3) marriage after divorce. (I) Bigamy however can hardly be said to be permissible $\nu \delta \mu \omega$ d $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \varphi$ (which must presumably refer to Roman law); and the Ms text can hardly be taken in any way except ' as those who, by human law, contract second marriages are sinners in the eyes of our teacher.' (2) Marriage after the death of a first wife was permitted by Roman law, and discouraged by some Church fathers on the authority of certain expressions of St Paul, e.g. by Athenagoras (Leg. 33), Origen, Theophilus, Tertullian (cf. Schaff Hist. of Ante-Nicene Christianity § 99). But no such view is found elsewhere in Justin, and the judgment of the Church never acquiesced in such a theory. (3) It seems then as if the reference here must probably be to marriage after divorce (so Thirlb., Otto) ; and so the three instances of unchastity mentioned are (r) looking on a woman lustfully, (2) marrying a divorced woman, (3) marrying a second wife after divorcing a first. Donaldson (Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctr. vol. ii, chap. iii, § 14 ad fin., his whole discussion of this passage
is worth reading) suggests with some force that $\delta i \gamma a \mu i a s$, to Justin's readers, would mean nothing but bigamy ; and he proposes the reading
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda o \ell, \pi \alpha \rho d \tau_{0} . \dot{\eta} \mu$. $\delta \iota \delta$. єíбi каi oi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \lambda є ́ \pi о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \kappa \tau \lambda$. This gives the most obvious meaning to $\delta i \gamma a \mu i a s$, and excellent sense to the passage. If the MS reading be retained, we must assume Justin to be using jiүapias ecclesiastically, in the second or third sense, forgetting what meaning his Roman readers would attach to it, and that he means, 'Who avail themselves of human law to commit what is really bigamy.'
2. oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu b \nu o \nu]$ Otto compares Iren. c. Haer. ii 32, I 'non solum qui moechatur expellitur sed et qui moechari uult.'
5. Є̇vөvuך $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu]^{\circ}$ 'thoughts.' Heb. iv 12 has $\epsilon \nu \theta \nu \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ in the same sense.
6. Ék $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu]$ See Int. p. xxxvii.
7. á $\phi \theta o \rho o \iota]$ may mean 'virgins' or, more simply, 'chaste.'

13. oủk $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{0 \nu}$ ] Cf. Matt. ix I3, Mark ii 17 , Luke v 32 .





















1. $\left.\theta \in \lambda \in \iota \gamma \alpha^{\rho} \rho\right]$ Cf. Ezek. xviii 23, xxxiii if 'nolo mortem impii sed ut conuertatur impius a uia sua et uiuat.' Similar ideas are expressed in 2 Pet. iii 9; I Tim. ii 4. Justin's phraseology here may be his own, based on Bible reminiscence; but he may possibly be quoting a traditional logion of Christ. ${ }^{\circ} 0 \pi$. $\delta$ oúpávos is clearly an echo of N.T. language, especially of St Matthew. " $\mathrm{H}=$ ' rather than.'
2. $\epsilon l$ dyanâtc] Cf. Matt.v 46, 47; Luke vi 32. Tí кацขд̀ тоєєíte is substituted for Matthew's riva
 and Luke's mola $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \quad \chi$ d́pıs $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau l \nu$.
 $\pi o t o v ̂ \mu \in \nu$. In place of Justin's $\pi \dot{\sigma} \rho \nu=\iota$ Matthew has $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{t}$, Luke $\dot{\alpha}_{\mu} \mu \mathrm{\rho} \tau \boldsymbol{\omega}$ -

入of (hence Thirlb. suggests movnpol in place of $\pi b \rho \nu o \iota$ here).
5. É $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ ठè $\dot{v} \mu i ̂ \nu]$ Cf. Matt. v 44; Luke vi 27,28 . It is variously quoted in various passages, e.g. Just. Tryph. 96 ärarãe roùs $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o u ̀ s \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu:$ Tert. $A p .3$ I Praeceptum est nobis etiam pro inimicis Deum orare et persecutoribus nostris bona precari' ; Iren. c. Haer. iii 18, 5 ' Diligite inimicos uestros et orate pro eis qui uos oderunt.'
9. $\operatorname{ma\nu } \tau i \tau \hat{\psi}$ airoûv $\tau l]$ Cf. Matt. v 42,46 ; Luke vi 30,34 .
13. $\dot{\mu} \mu \in \hat{i} s \delta e ̀ ~ \mu \eta ́] ~ C f . ~ M a t t . ~ v i ~ 19, ~$ 20.
16. Tl $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \tau a l] ~ C f . ~ M a t t . ~$ xvi 26 , vi 20.
20. $\gamma(\nu \in \sigma \theta \epsilon \delta \epsilon] \quad \mathrm{Cf}$. Matt. v 48, 45; Luke vi 35, 36. Justin Tryph.



 av̉тá. 15. $\mu \eta े$ ov̂v $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \tau \epsilon \tau i ́ \phi a ́ \gamma \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{\eta}$ тí є่v- 5





 є̀v toîs ov̉pavoîs.








${ }_{17} \boldsymbol{a} \dot{a} \gamma \gamma a p \in \dot{v} o \nu t i ́ \sigma \epsilon$ Otto $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma$. $\sigma o i ́$ A Post $\mu i \lambda \iota o \nu$ nescio an êv (ob anteced lit p) exciderit Otto

96 has $\gamma i \nu \in \sigma \theta \in \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau$ оi кai oiктl $\rho \mu о \nu \in s$ ஸ́s кal ò $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ ن́ $\mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ ó oủ $\rho a ́ v l o s . ~ к а і ~$




 read here $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ ov̀s кai < $\alpha \gamma a \theta$ ou's каi $\beta \rho \dot{́} \chi \epsilon \ell$ é $\pi i>\delta \iota \kappa a t o u s . ~ A n d ~ O t t o ~$ каì סıкаlous <каi $\beta \rho \epsilon \in \chi \in \iota ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i$ ó olovs> kai movทpoús. The triplet of the MS text is certainly very clumsy.
2. $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu a \tau \epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. vi 25 ff. $3 \mathrm{I}-33$; Luke xii 22 ff. 29-31, 34 ; Matt. vi 21.
10. $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi o \imath \eta \tau \epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. vi 1. This answers to the $\pi \rho \delta s$ тotềv above.
16. Quotations to showe Christ's teaching on patience, readiness to help others, freedom from wrath, truth-speaking, worship of God, practice of religion.
14. $\tau \hat{\psi} \tau \dot{\sim} \pi \tau \tau 0 \nu \tau \iota]$ Cf. Luke vi 29, Matt. v 39. ${ }^{2}$ (ajobva literally ' jaw.'
16. $\left.\delta s \delta^{\prime} d \nu \delta \rho \gamma \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}\right]$ Cf. Matt. v 22 ; the phrase $\gamma \in \epsilon \nu \nu a \nu$ тồ $\pi v \rho$ ós is again simplified as in c. 15, 2. Tò $\pi \hat{v} \rho=\tau \dot{\partial}$ al $\omega \nu \iota o \nu \pi \hat{v} \rho$.
17. mavci $\delta \grave{\text { à ả } \gamma \gamma a \rho \text {.] Cf. Matt. }}$
 into service as a courier.'
18. $\lambda a \mu \psi a ́ \tau \omega \delta \delta]$ Cf. Matt. v 16.
20. oủ $\gamma a ̀ \rho a ̉ \nu \tau \alpha i \rho \epsilon เ \nu]$ Cf. Matt. v 39. 'Avtal $\rho \in \iota=$ 'withstand.'






 $\sigma а \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \grave{\eta} \sigma \nu \mu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ тєє $\rho a \theta$ Є́vtєऽ．5．$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$



 $\epsilon i \pi \omega ́ \nu . ~ М є \gamma i ́ \sigma \tau \eta ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \tau o \lambda \eta ́ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota . ~ K u ́ p ı o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ v ~ \sigma o v ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-~$




$$
4 \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \text { Otto } \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \hat{\prime} \nu \omega \nu \mathrm{A}
$$

 The subject is Christ，understood．

4．$\delta \gamma \dot{a} \rho \kappa \alpha l] \quad \gamma d \rho=\gamma \epsilon d \rho \alpha$ ．T $\hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi a \rho$＇$\dot{v} \mu i v \nu \quad \gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu=$＇those who were of your side，＇i．e．heathens． ＇ $\mathrm{E} \pi i=$＇in the case of．＇

6．$\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon$ кт $\kappa$ ．］＇conquered＇， either by the constancy of life which they traced in（Christian）neigh－ bours，or by the strange endurance which they noticed in defrauded fellow－travellers or experienced in those with whom they had dealings．＇ $\Pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma u \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ is a pure passive， and is found in classical Greek． Here again Justin supports Chris－ tianity by an appeal to its ethical influence as in c．14， 2.

10．$\mu \dot{\eta}$ ל $\langle\delta \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ］Cf．Matt．v 34， 37 ；James v 12 ．In Clem． Hom．，xix 2，the quotation occurs in the same form as here：E＇atw $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \delta \nu$ 人ai $\nu a l$ кai Tò ồ oṽ．Prob－ ably the form was traditional ；it is that found in James，loc．cit．（with

グT $\omega$ instead of $\notin \sigma \tau \omega$ ），and，as West－ cott points out（N．T．Canon，ad loc．），in Clem．Strom．v 14， 100 ； Epiph．adu．Haer．i 20， 6.

13．$\mu \epsilon \gamma / \sigma \tau \eta$ द̇vтo入 $\eta$＇］Cf．Mark xii 29， 30 ；Luke $\times 27$ ；though Justin＇s phraseology differs consider－ ably from that of the two Evan－ gelists．The last clause Kúpoov Tò $\theta \in \delta \nu$ тòv $\pi o u \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau d \quad \sigma \in$ may perhaps be added to combat the Gnostic distinction between the Creator of Judaism and the God of Christianity． Justin Tryph． 93 cites the same passage more in accordance with


 $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ iov $\sigma o u$ ús $\sigma \epsilon a u t b \nu$.

16．кal $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta$ bvtos］Cf．Mark $x$ 17，18；Luke xviii 18，19； Matt．xix 17．＇O $\pi 0 เ \eta$ бas $\tau \dot{d} \pi d \nu \tau a$ is again an addition．Clemr．Hom．








 $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i ́ a \nu ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ o u ̉ p a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’$ ó $\pi o \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$ тò Ө́́ $\lambda \eta \mu a$ тоv̂ matpós $\mu$ ov tov̂ év toîs ov̉pavoîs．IO．ôs





 äठıкоє $\pi$ є́ $\mu \psi \omega \nu \tau a \iota \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a i ́ \omega \nu \iota o \nu ~ \pi v ̂ \rho . ~ 13 . ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~$





 $\dot{v} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ ả $\mathfrak{\imath} \iota o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．

$$
\text { I6 } \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota \text { Otto } \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota \mathrm{A}
$$

oủpavoîs．Justin Tryph．ior quotes



7．oưx $\pi$ âs $\dot{\delta} \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma$ ．］Cf．Matt． vii 21 ．

9．ठs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ dakov́ $\epsilon$ ］Cf．Matt． vii 24 ；Luke x 16 ；Matt．x 40 ； John xiv 24．Justin＇s phrase may be from an unwritten logion of Christ or may be a rough synopsis， composed by himself，of Christian precepts．

11．$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0 l$ ठè $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota]$ Cf．Matt． vii 22,23 ；xiii 42,43 ；Luke xiii 26－28．Justin Tryph． 76 has mo入入ol



 ＇A $\nu a \chi \omega \rho \in i ̂ \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi$＇$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \hat{v}$ ．

16．$\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \psi \nu \tau \alpha l]$ a middle aorist， used in a passive sense，parallel to $\lambda \alpha \mu \psi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ．
ib．$\pi$ o $\lambda$ dol $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta{ }^{n} \xi$ ．］Cp．Matt． vii $15,16,19$ ；xxiv 5．Justin Tryph． 35 has $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol è $\lambda$ é＇テovtal èmi

 $\lambda$ и́коє äpтауєs．

17. I. Фópovs $\delta \in ̀ ~ \kappa a i ~ \epsilon i \sigma \phi o \rho a ̀ s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ i ́ \phi ’ ~ v i \mu \omega ̂ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon \tau а \gamma-~$ $\mu \in ́ v o \iota s ~ \pi a \nu \tau a \chi o \hat{v} \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a ~ \phi є ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ \grave{\varsigma}$



 ảעтатєкрірато av̉тоî. 'Ажо́סотє oû̀ тà Kaíбapos т $\hat{\nu}$
 بо́vov тробкvขov̂ $\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{v} \mu i ̂ \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda a ~ \chi a i \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~$








17. Christ taught us to be obedient citizens; we pay all taxes, and, though we worship God alone, we pray for our rulers. However, if you will not listen to us, yours is the responsibility, in proportion to the greatness of the power's entrusted to you.

The early Christians certainly acknowledged the claims of civil law and government to their obedience; but they were reluctant to take an active share in politics. They were peaceable subjects, and some served in the legions, though others refused to do so ; but they were indifferent to, and partially averse from, the civil government of an 'idolatrous' state. They obeyed the laws, except in regard to religion, but they did not seek for office in a state, whose political ceremonial was closely connected with a religion which they repudiated. Cf. Tert. Apol. 38 ' Nec ulla res aliena magis quam publica.'

This followed necessarily from the intimate union of religion and politics which the Augustan system had established.

1. $\phi$ ópous... $\epsilon$ l $\sigma$ фopás] The former word refers to the regular taxation usually assessed on the census; the latter to special taxes.
2. $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ aủ $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ] i.e. Christ. Justin makes ne reference to Rom. xiii I-7, because he is only quoting Christ's words.
ib. кат' éкєivo] Cf. Matt. xxii 17-21; Luke xx 21-25.
3. $\theta \epsilon \delta \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa v \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] The great test of the Christians on trial was the order to sacrifice to the Emperor.
 I Tim. ii I, 2, and the prayer in Clem. Rom. ad Corinth. c. 61, quoted by Schaff, Hist. of anteNic. Christianity, \& 66, note ad fin.
4. $\pi \rho \partial s$ dva入oylav] Cf. Matt. xxy 15 .



18．I．＇ $\mathrm{A} \pi o \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \psi a \tau \epsilon \gamma$ àp $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda o s ~ є ́ \kappa a ́ \sigma \tau o v ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 áठiкоıs тâ$\sigma \iota \nu$.

2．ả $\lambda \lambda ’$＇$\pi \epsilon \epsilon i$ каì aï $\sigma \theta \eta \sigma \varsigma ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \gamma \in \nu o-~$
 $\sigma \eta \tau \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa a i ̀ \pi \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ őт८ ả $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha ́ \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \iota$. 3．ขєкvонаутєîaı $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ јàp каì ai à $\delta \iota a \phi \theta_{0} \rho \omega \nu \pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu$



$9 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota a \phi \theta \delta \rho \omega \nu$ marg $\mathrm{A} \delta \iota a \phi \theta \delta \rho \omega \nu \mathrm{~A}$

1．$\left.\ddagger \pi \pi \hat{\Psi}^{\circ} \nu \nu\right]$ Cf．Luke xii $4^{8}$ ． Otto refers to Clem．Strom．ii，p．
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \iota \tau \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau \alpha L$.

18．Life is eternal；extinction would indeed be a boon to the wicked； but sense remains and punishment awaits．The customs of Gentile religions and the teaching of your philosophers and poets would attest this for you．Listen then to our teaching，as you do to theirs．We believe in a God，no less than others believe；we even hold that He will be able to effect a resurrection of bodies．

5．$\quad \delta \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \ell \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］A reminiscence of Plato Phaedo ro7 C el $\mu \in ̀ \nu$ rà $\rho$

 Id．Apol． 40 еlтє $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu i \alpha$ al $\sigma \theta \eta \sigma$ is छ̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oîo $\kappa \in ́ \rho \delta o s$ àp $\epsilon^{\ell l \eta}$ ò $\theta$ ávatos．Justin


 properly＇a gift of Hermes，＇i．e． ＇a godsend．＇

6．$\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ रevouťvots］＇all men that have been．＇

9．ขєкvода⿱亠тєial $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The 2nd century after Christ saw a general return to religion；super－
stition prevailed and miracles were fashionable，as the story of Apol－ lonius of Tyana shows；astrology was encouraged，as can be seen from Tacitus＇reference to the mathematici in Hist．i 22，＇genus hominum quod in ciuitate nostra et uetabitur semper et retinebitur．＇ Neкvoиаутєiac are＇oracles of the dead，＇like that near lake Aornos in Thesprotia．Cf．Herod．v 92， § 7.
ib．ai ád $\delta \alpha \phi \theta$ óp $\omega \nu$ r．è．］Ac－ cording to Socrates H．E．iii I3， this refers to the sacrifice of innocent children and the inspection of their entrails．Presumably this was a way of taking special omens．Cf． Dion．Al．apud Euseb．H．E．vii
 á日入íous ảтобфа́ттєıン каі тє́кva $\delta v \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\nu} \omega \nu \quad \pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ катаӨv́єєข каi $\sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi \nu \alpha$ $\nu \in \circ \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \iota \rho \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，and Eus． viii $I_{4}$（of Maxentius）$\mu a \gamma \iota \kappa a i$ s

 $\chi^{\nu a} \beta \rho \epsilon \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ ठ $\delta \epsilon \rho \in u \nu \omega \mu$ évov．Cic． in Vat．6，$I_{4}$＇cum puerorum extis deos manis mactare soleas．＇

10．$\psi v \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$ ．$\kappa \lambda$ ．］Necro－ mancy．＇Summoning＇s of human souls．＇
II．$\delta \nu \epsilon \iota \rho о \pi о \mu \pi \sigma!]$ A general












term for spirits which send dreams. $\Pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \delta \rho o l$, familiar spirits in particular. The same collocation (doubtless with reference to this passage) occurs in Iren. i 23,4 . See also Eus. Hist. Eccl. iv 7.
I. $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \dot{a} \omega \omega \sigma a \nu]$ Justin does not commit himself to any positive assertion about the genuineness of these oracular deliverances. He merely asks that his readers should believe that there is a survival after death on the authority of their own religious customs, and so be ready to listen to Christian teaching on the subject.
 6. Joseph. Bell. Iud. vii 6, 3 mentions a herb, supposed to be efficacious for driving away demons ' which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them ' (Whiston's translation).
 araus. His oracle at Mallos in Cilicia was famous in Pausanias' time, circ. A.D. 180.
6. $\left.\Delta \omega \delta \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}\right]$ oracle of Zeus, where omens were given from the groves of oak and beech-trees.
ib. Ilutous] oracle of Apollo at Delphi, where the prophetess sat
on a tripod over a chasm whence fumes arose.
7. 'Е $\mu \pi \epsilon \delta$ ок $\lambda$ éous] circ. 450 в.С. He taught that all living souls had once been divine spirits, who had been banished to earth for some crime, but could be restored by abstinence and expiatory rites.
8. $\Pi v \theta a \gamma \delta \rho o v]$ 6th century b.c. He taught that souls are embodied because of $\sin$, and after death will go into Kosmos or Tartarus according to their deserts, or have to pass through life again as men or animals.
ib. Пла́тшдб́s т. к. $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho$.] Socrates regards a future life as probable. Plato seems on the whole to believe in it, and in an eventual incorporeal immortality. Probably the reference here is to the myth which closes the de Republica.
ib. $\delta \pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} 0 \mu \eta \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\beta} \delta \theta \rho$.] Homer Od. xi 25 etc.
 view the things in Hades.'
10. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon[\pi b \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ refers back to
 'Oס. $\epsilon$ ls r. т. $\dot{\text { entor. is, somewhat }}$ awkwardly, inserted as a parenthesis.
 note ad loc., and 2 Cor, xi 16 кàv $\dot{\omega}$ ádpova $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon$. So here it is - receive us, even if you recive us only on an equality zoith them.'









 íєє̂̀ ує


 тolô̂ó $\tau$ roóv $\delta \epsilon$ ot̂o $\tau \epsilon$ Otto

1. $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a]$ A clear profession of belief in a resurrection of the body. See Introd., p. xxxii. Cf. Justin Apol. i 52, 3; Tryph. 80
 бтámeӨa: Vet. Eccl. Rom. Symb.

2. Without evidence, we should find the process of human generation incredible. Similarly, resurrection is diffcult for you to believe in, because you have never seen a dead man come to life again. But the processes may be considered analogous. It is dishonouring to God to say that He cannot raise the dead; and Christ has taught us that God can do what man cannot.
3. คav[סos] 'drop.' A similar argument is found in Tat. Or. 6, Athenag. de Resurr. 17.
 supposition.'
4. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ov̂at toloútots $\mu . \tau$.] ' not being such nor sprung from such (as you are).' Tooótcy is genitive of origin. Perion. inserts $\epsilon \kappa$.

1I. ởк äv $\tau$ Is $\tau 0 \lambda \mu_{0} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau_{0}$.] 'Would
you believe? No one would dare to contradict (and say that you would disbelieve).' Such a confusion of elliptical phraseology seems to be due to the negative assertion involved in the question: 'You would not believe, would you? Nor will anyone dare to contradict me and say you would.' Similar confusions are found in Plato, e.g. Rep. 336 e
 otov $\gamma^{\epsilon} \sigma v$, $\bar{\omega} \phi i \lambda \epsilon$ (Stallbaum emends to $\mu \eta$ olov $\sigma \dot{\prime}$ ), where the affirmative $\sigma \pi o v o ́ a ́ s e l \nu$ has to be understood with olou $\gamma$ e. Phaedo 68 B oúk
 $\chi \rho \eta$. A fairly parallel case is seen in Justin Tryph. 33 iєpev̀s $\delta \grave{\text { ®̀ }}$ öт七
 àvelтeìv тo $\lambda \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, 'That Hezekiah was not a priest, you will not be able to contradict (and say that he was).' Otto also quotes

 àveenteiv. But that is a perfectly normal use of two paratactic sentences.
















 $\mu \in \nu$ A
5. á $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma \mathfrak{l} \nu \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{v} \sigma$.$] Cf. I Cor.$ xv 53. The $\delta \ell \kappa \eta \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ makes it the more probable that this text was in Justin's mind.
7. of фáбкоутєs] This is the Stoic theory of orthodox Pantheism, according to which the whole universe is permeated by the anima mundi, into which the nature of human beings, after purgation, is eventually resolved. Cf. Virg. Georg. iv 219 ff ; Aen. vi 724 ff.
8. тapà taûta] 'beyond this.'
 Otto translates 'quae et sua natura et hominibus sunt impossibilia.' 'This seems an impossible rendering; even in an uncritical age, the belief in things, which are by their nature impossible, is scarcely widespread; nor did Christ urge such credulity. Maran translates with more regard to natural probability, ' Quae et nostrae naturae et aliorum
hominum uires superant.' So too Veil, 'Dinge die unserer eigenen Natur und überhaupt den Menschen unmöglich sind.'
15. Tà d́ $\delta u ́ v a \tau a]$ Cf. Luke xviii 27; Matt. xix 26; Mark x 27. Otto quotes here Celsus' objection,
 атокрірабөає катафєи́үоибєข єis
 $\delta \nu \nu a \tau \partial \nu \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}^{*} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ оช้т८ $\gamma \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ aloxpà ò $\theta$ eòs oúvatal oủdè tà $\pi \alpha \rho a ̀$ фи́бıv ßoúлєтaı. Both of Celsus' limitations are perfectly valid. God cannot be false to His own moral character ; nor does He act in defiance of His own natural laws. But the force of this second limitation depends on (1) our knowledge of natural law; (2) the extent to which we must presume our knowledge to be defective, as, for instance, in cases postulated to be unique.






 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ àvá $\lambda \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ סıà $\pi v \rho o ̀ s$ é申aбav．2．oi $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́-$


7 ＇Y $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \eta$ s Otto＇Y $\Upsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \iota \mathrm{s} \mathrm{A}$

I．$\mu \grave{\eta} \phi o \beta \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Cf．Luke xii 4， 5 ；Matt．x 28.

4．रéєvpa］See Hastings Dict． of the Bib．s．v．＇Gehenna．

20．your own oracles and phi－ losophers foretell a fiery end to the world．And many of our views resemble those of poets and others whom you honour，or only differ from them in being nobler and more divine，and demonstratively proved．

7．$\Sigma i \beta u \lambda \lambda a]$ The Sibylline oracles are a medley of Jewish and Christian fictions about a golden age，the future of Rome，the end of the world．They are the work of various authors in various cen－ turies，and were arranged in a con－ nected series in the Middle Ages． （Cf．Hastings Dict．Bibl．s．v．； Milman Hist．of Christ．ii 7， Geffcken＇s edition ；Texte und Un－ tersuchungen Bd xxiii．）They are quoted by many of the early Christian fathers．The passages here alluded to may be Orac．Sibyll．ii 196 ff．
 al $\theta$ o $\mu \notin \nu$ оto
 $\delta a \pi \alpha \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota$
（unless Bk ii is rightly supposed to date from the 3 rd cent．）；or iv 172 ff．$\pi \hat{v} \rho$ है $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ кard үaîà $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ． （ Pk iv is said to be of the reign of ＇Titus．）
ib．＇గбтá $\sigma \pi \eta s$ ］A Persian Magus，
supposed to have lived in Zoroaster＇s time and to have issued oracles． He is quoted by Clem．Alex．and Lactant．＇A $\nu \alpha \lambda^{\lambda} \omega \sigma \iota \nu=$＇consumption．＇
 Many Stoics regarded the $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \circ$ as immortal，and Justin＇s statement here does not give what is generally supposed to have been the orthodox Stoic idea，though the Stoics did assert the ultimate resolution of the world into fire．Yet Justin can hardly have misconceived entirely the Stoic position，nor have falsified it in a treatise addressed to M． Aurelius．It is possible that，as Stoicism was based on Pantheism and identified God with the universe， it might go further and identify this God with fire，borrowing the Hera－ clitean notion of fire as the primal element of the universe．Cf．August． de Ciu．D．viii 5 ＇Stoici in igne cau－ sam principiumque rerum esse dixe－ runt＇；and he adds that they call this principle＇uiuens et sapiins et mundi fabricator＇；Plut．de Placit． Phılos．I， 6 （p． 879 c）ópísovtaı т ${ }^{2} \nu$ тoû $\theta$ Eiou oủテial of $\Sigma \tau \omega i ̈ \kappa o l ~ o u ̈ t \omega . ~$
 $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \mu о \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu, \mu \in \tau \alpha \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda 10 \nu \delta \hat{\varepsilon}$ eis â队ои́入єtal：ib．7， 17 oi $\Sigma$ rwïкоl

 ко́б $\mu$ ои．














 ouрүòv то̂̂ бкєvaそонє́vou äтєфйขауто．





6．$\theta \epsilon i \omega s$ ］i．e．＇suitably to God．＇
 tianity alone can prove its dogmas about God，by the revelation of Christ．
ib．$\pi$ apd̀ $\pi$ davtas］＇beyond all others．＇

8．IIतát $\omega$ yos］Certainly this is the general idea of Plato＇s philosophy．

10．Ev alo $\sigma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon t]$＇to be sensibly punished．＇

14．$\pi$ тобкиveiv］with dative． This is found in late Greek．Cf． Matt．ii 2， 11 ；John iv 23．Justin uses it with the accusative also； cf．c． 17,3 ，and many other passages．
ib．Mevady $\delta \rho \omega$ ］He is quoted in pseudo－Justin de Monarch．5， and these or similar passages may be in mind here：（quoted as from the Hiereia）

 ò тои̂то $\pi \circ \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$ є́ $\sigma \tau i \mu \epsilon i\} \omega \nu$ тои̂ $\theta \epsilon o v ̂:$ and（quoted as from the Diphilus） ס七ótı тd̀ övta кúplov $\pi$ ávт $\omega \nu$ á $\ell$
 цо⿱丷天。

21．Our story of Christ is in many respects analogous to heathen stories about Zeus＇various sons，and to your own belief in deified Emperors． Of course the immoralities of Zeus and others are the work of evil demons．Only the good are immor－ tal，as we teach；the wicked are punished in eternal fire．

Justin＇s argument in this chapter is perhaps partly ad captandum？； partly however it arises from his view of the Divine preparation for Christ in heathendom，the work of the Spermatic Logos．














$12 \dot{o} \mu \mathrm{o}$ íws Otto ómolous A |. I4 aủroкpátopas oús Thirlb om oùs A
3. oú tapà toùs $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'We$ bring forward nothing new, as compared with those whom you call sons of Zeus.' The dative $\tau \hat{\psi} \Delta t t$ is influenced by $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu e ́ v o u s$, 'ascribed to Zeus as sons.'
6. 'Ep $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu]$ The symbolical explanation of Hermes as the interpretative word, and teacher of all, was the work of the later Rationalistic school. Cf. i 22, 2 ; Clem. Al. Strom. vi 15 .
 traditionally held to have been struck with thunder by Zeus, because he had been bribed to recall a dead man to life. Cf. Pind. Pyth. iii 55 ; Plat. Rep. 408 B; Eur. Alc. 3 ; Virg. Aen. vii 770. His most famous shrine was at Epidaurus.
8. $\Delta \in \delta \nu v \sigma o \nu]$ This refers to the myth of Dionysus Zagreus, which originated in Crete (Diod. Sic. v 75,4 ) and was connected with Orphism ; we hear of it mainly in late authors. The myth was that Dionysus was lured from the charge of the Kouretes by the Titans, who tore him in pieces. Zeus punished
${ }^{t}$ hem and restored him to life. Cf. Harrison Proleg. to Gk Relig. c. 10. 9. 'Hраклє́a] Herakles burnt himself to put an end to the pains caused by Nessus' shirt (Soph. Trachin.). $\Pi \delta \nu \omega \nu$ here probably $=$ dolores (Otto). Most however take it as =labours. The dative $\phi v \gamma \hat{n}$ is a little strange.

Io. $\Delta$ lookoúpous] Castor and Pollux.
ib. $\Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon \in a]$ Cf. i 54,8 . Justin is probably thinking of the story that Perseus and Andromeda were placed among the stars after death.
 $\Pi \eta \gamma \alpha \dot{\sigma} o v$ goes with $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \lambda \eta \lambda u \theta \in \dot{v}$ al eis oúpavby, which must be supplied throughout. According to Hor. Od. iv 11,26 , Pind. Isthm. vi 44 , his ride to heaven on Pegasus failed. Either Justin knew some other myth on the subject, or his memory is here at fault.
13. катทбтєрiб日aı] 'to have been placed among the stars.'
ib. kal $\tau i$ रáp] $\lambda \epsilon \gamma$ о $\mu \in \nu$ must be understood.
14. $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \theta a \nu a r i \xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \xi$.] Either
 àvєр $\chi$ ó $\mu \in \nu о \nu$ єis тòv oủpavò̀ тòv катакає́vта Kaíбapa;
















'claiming that they are immortal' or 'thinking right to deify.'

1. $\langle\mu \nu u ́ v \tau a ~ \tau t \nu a ́] ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ k n o w n ~$ to have happened in the cases of Romulus and Julius Caesar; and at the funeral of Augustus ' nec defuit uir praetorius qui se effigiem cremati euntem in caelum uidisse iuraret' ${ }^{\text {' }}$ (Suet. Aug. 100). The idea is burlesqued in the Apocolocyntosis.
2. ठıaфo $\alpha$ a $]$ 'advantage, profit.' II оотротй ' instruction.' The context here is presumably ironical.
3. ìs каi... $\pi \alpha \rho a \delta \epsilon \xi a \sigma \theta a l]$ 'as to believe that he, who is according to them (кat' aúroús) the head and father of all,' etc.
4. $\pi a \tau \rho \circ \phi b \nu \tau \eta \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The usual story was that Zeus mutilated and deposed Kronos, as Kronos had treated Uranus. There was no story of successive murder; the word $\pi a \tau \rho \circ ф 6 \nu \tau \eta s$ only applies roughly. The same condemnation
of Greek mythology as Justin here expresses is found in Plato Rep. ii, iii.
5. $\dot{\omega} \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \emptyset \phi \eta \mu \epsilon$ ] c. 5.
6. $\alpha \pi \alpha \theta a \nu a r i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota]$ is used of a happy immortality. There is no hint here of conditional immortality, for the wicked are said to 'suffer eternal punishment.

7. If Christ were mere man, He would be worthy of being called 'Son of God' because of His zvisdom. But wee say that He was the Word of God born in a special way, like your legrend of Hermes;-He was crucified; and many of your sons of Zeus suffered;-He was born of a virgin; so was Perseus;-He healed the sick and raised the dead; so did Asclepius.

Justin has no fear of the 'argument from comparative religion.' The heathen fables, according to

кoıvês $\mu o ́ v o \nu ~ a ̈ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s, ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \sigma o \phi i ́ a \nu ~ a ̈ \xi ı o s ~ v i o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ ~ \lambda e ́-~$



 $\lambda i ́ \gamma o l l ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ ~ a ́ \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota \nu . ~ 3 . ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \delta e ̀ ~$









him, are the work of the demons' cunning (cf. c. 54, etc.). But they ought at any rate to predispose the heathen to find nothing ridiculous in the Christian creed.
I. кolvês] contrasted with $i \delta / \omega s$ later.
2. $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho]$ i.e. it is not incongruous to call a man 'the son of God.'
 'contrasted with, different from, the ordinary method of birth.' The reference is probably to the eternal generation of the Logos, as indicated by the comparison with Hermes. The Virgin-birth is later compared with the Perseus-myth.
 mesias C. 21, I.

## ib. 'Ер $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu]$ Cf. i 2 2, 2.

8. «рокатпр: $\theta \mu \eta \mu$ йvoss] In c. 21.- Yioîs кat' $\dot{\text { u }} u$ âs toû $\Delta t o ́ s$ is a single phrase 'those whom you call sons of Zeus.'
9. oủx $\delta \mu o t a]$ They did not all suffer the same death; therefore Christ is not inferior to them, because His death was of a special nature.
 tive of that in respect of which he might be thought $\eta^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega v$.
10. ஸ́s и̇тєбхо́mє $\theta a]$ Cf. с. 13.
 refer, as Otto suggests, to the quotations from Christ's teaching in cc. $\mathrm{I}_{5}-17$; but perhaps better to the $\pi \rho \dot{d} \xi \epsilon \epsilon$ of Christ, i.e. His miracles, and the moral effects of Christianity. The sentence $\delta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ крєiтT $\omega \nu$ кт入. is caught up again by Iren. ii 30, 5 .
11. סcà $\pi a \rho \theta \in ́ v \nu u]$ Jerome objected to this use of $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ as tainted with Valentinian heresy. The Valentinians denied the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \alpha \rho \theta \in \nu \quad 0$. According to them, as Tertullian puts it, Christ was born transmeatorio potius quam generatorio more, i.e. He was not very man of the substance of His mother. But Jerome's criticism is too subtle. The Church fathers use $\delta i \dot{\alpha}$ or per in no heretical sense, and Justin
 distinction of significance.
12. Пе $\rho \sigma \in a]$ Son of Jupiter and Danae.


 фа́бкєьд סógo $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ．



 Sıà тò тav̉тà $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ av̉тoîs тapaסє $\chi$ Ө̂̀vaı ả $\xi \iota o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，ả $\lambda \lambda$＇ го öт८ тò d̉入ך $\theta$ ès $\lambda$ é $\gamma \boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon \nu$ ．

2．каì＇I $\eta \sigma o$ v̂s X $\rho \iota \sigma$ тòs $\mu$ ǹ $о$ оs








 ．．．eineîu Veil
x．rovipoús］if genuine，must mean＇infirm＇；but perhaps we should read $\pi \eta \rho o u ́ s . ~ C f . ~ T r y p h . ~ 69 . ~$ For the confusion between the two words，see Robinson Ep．to the Ephes．p．272．Пapa入utikós is a N．T．word，found in Matthew and Mark．Luke has the more technical


23．I shall now prove（I）that Christianily is alone true and its creed anterior to heathen myths； （2）that fesus Christ was the Son of God in a unique sense；（3）that the heathon myths are due to demons．

This order is not strictly adhered to in the following chapters；Justin＇s method is not carefully systematic ； but his three arguments may be roughly arranged as follows：（i）cc． 24－29；（2）cc．30－53；（3）cc．54－60． 6．т $ิ \hat{\nu} \pi \rho \circ \in \lambda \theta$ ．aùvoû $\pi \rho \circ \phi$ ．］
＇The prophets who preceded Him．＇ Aúvoû is genitive after $\pi \rho o$ in com－ position．Liddell and Scott quote Xen．Cyr．ii 2，7，as a case of a similar usage．П $\rho \circ \hat{\epsilon} \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a t$ is found with the accusative in N．T．，e．g． Mark vi 33.
9．aúroís］refers to $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a-$ $\phi \epsilon \omega \nu$ ．

10．кal＇＇I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s]$ g̀ $\% \iota$ is understood． ＇$\Upsilon \pi \alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu=$＇being beforehand．＇

12．трштотокоs］Cf．33，6；53， 2；63，15；Col．i 15；and Light－ foot＇s note ad loc．
ib．סóvapus］Cf．I Cor．i 24.
ib．$\tau \hat{\eta} \beta$ ßou $\hat{\eta}$ aưroû］Christ was incarnate by the will of God．See Introd．，p．xxvi．

13．＇ $\bar{\pi}$＇$\dot{d} \lambda \lambda a \gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇for the$ conversion and restoration of the human race．＇See Introd．，p．xxvi．

15．$\phi \theta$ dбavтés $\tau$ ．кт入．］This sen－



 тоипоо́нє ${ }^{\text {a }}$.




 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aỉt $\omega \hat{\nu}$ ن́тò $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \iota \mu \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} a ้ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \circ \chi o ́ \sigma \epsilon$,



tence is exceedingly confused. The subject of èv $\eta$ рү $\quad \sigma a \nu$ must be the demons, in which case it seems natural to make them also the subject of $\epsilon \Pi \pi o \nu$; but this is forbidden by the $\delta i \dot{\alpha} \tau \ldots . \ldots \delta a l \mu o \nu a s$. Who then are the $\tau \nu \mathrm{ves}$ ? Otto explains the reference as being to the mithologi, and compares ii 4 (5), 5 and i $54, \mathrm{I}$; though in the first of these parallels no distinction is drawn between poets and mythologists, and the second has no reference to mythologists at all. Still it is possible that Justin regards the myth-makers as being prior to the poets (by whom he especially means Homer), and therefore one step nearer to the demons, the original influences, the poets being thus in a rough sense the prophets of the myth-makers (Otto's alteration of $\delta \dot{\iota} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ to $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ is unnecessary). Tives therefore would be the original makers of the myths, the direct mouthpieces of the demons; but in the second half of the sentence the demons come into more prominence, and they are
 reading avoids the difficulty, but it seems to give an unnatural turn of
expression. The simplest emendation, if any is required, would be to omit the second $\delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha}$, making $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi o \iota \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ depend upon tives. Veil considers the whole sentence to have been originally in the accus. and infin., and to have been corrected into nomin. and indic., the two readings being subsequently contaminated by an unintelligent scribe.

1. $\pi \rho о є \iota \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0 \cup s]$ Cf. cc. $5 ; 21$.
2. Ėvทํp $\eta \eta \sigma a \nu$ ] 'they brought about the slanderous impieties which are alleged against us,' i.e. caused the slanderous allegation of impiety. Justin may have had in mind the N.T. conception of èvepreîv as meaning spiritual influence within men, cf. 26, I; Mark vi 14 ; I Cor. xii 6 , II, etc.
3. Firstly; though various people worship various gods, yet we alone are persecuted for our particular form of worship.

This is Justin's first proof that Christianity is alone true.
8. $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi \chi \hat{\nu}]$ There seems to be an especial reference here to Egyptian cultus.
13. $\mu$ خ̀ roùs aúroús] The use of $\mu \eta$ instead of ov in indirect quotation


 є่ $\pi i ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta$.


 $\kappa а і ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu, \kappa а i ~ o i ~ \Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon ф о ́ \nu \eta \nu ~ к а i ~ ' А \phi \rho о \delta i ́ t \eta \nu, ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \delta i a ̀ ~$
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after verbs of saying and thinking is common in late Greek.

1. $̇ \in \nu \tau a \phi a i ̂ s]$ This emendation seems almost inevitable. Maran urges the retention of rpaфaîs, which, he maintains, might mean 'statues,' though the parallels which he quotes hardly prove his case. But, whether the word could be so translated here, or would have to be taken in its usual sense of 'pictures,' the preposition $\begin{gathered}\text { ev s seems very ob- }\end{gathered}$ jectionable.
2. $\delta \quad \tau \iota$ rà $\rho$ oũ $\nu$ ] The MS reading could give a conceivable sense, if ou $\frac{1}{2}$ aúrd were taken together as equivalent to 'different, various things.' But the emendation ouvy is a very slight alteration and greatly improves the sentence. An alternative would be to omit ou altogether.
3. iєрєia] 'victims.'
4. Secondly; in spite of the danger of death we have turned aside from your impure gods to the unbegotten, impassible, pure God.

This is the second proof that Christianity is alone true.

8. חє $\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \phi \dot{\nu} \eta \nu]$ There is no reference here to the rape of Proserpine by Pluto. The story here alluded to, told by Apollodorus, is that Aphrodite gave the infant Adonis to Persephone to keep in safety. She admired him and refused to give him up. The consequent dispute between the two goddesses was appeased by Zeus, who decided that Adonis should remain for one-third of each year by himself, and should spend the rest of the year in equal portions with Aphrodite and Persephone.
9. olotpn $\begin{gathered}\text { eidas] 'stung to mad- }\end{gathered}$ ness.' Olotpos literally $=$ 'gadfly.'
12. $\left.{ }^{2} \gamma \epsilon \nu \bar{\eta} \eta \dot{T} \varphi, \dot{\alpha} \pi a \theta \in \hat{i}\right]$ As Otto remarks, the former epithet is to be contrasted with $\tau \delta \nu \Sigma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta\rangle$ and тòv $\Lambda \eta \tau 0 i \not \partial \eta \nu$, the latter with ràs ola $\rho \eta \eta$ eifas.
13. éautoùs àve 日.] Cf. c. 14, 2.






26．I．Tpitov $\delta^{\prime}$ öт८ каì $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \grave{a} \nu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \tau о \hat{v}$
 tıvàs $\lambda$ éyoutas éautoùs єîvaı $\theta$ єov́s，oî oủ $\mu$ óvov oủk

 Гit $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，òs є̇ $\pi i$ K $\lambda a v \delta i o u ~ K a i ́ \sigma a \rho o s ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma o u ́ \nu-~$



 A $\mu a \gamma \iota \kappa \alpha ̀ s ~ \pi o \iota \eta \quad \sigma a s ~ E u s ~|\mid ~ 13 ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \delta \iota ~ A ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda l \delta \iota ~ E u s ~$

1．то̂̂ éкатоעтáxєıpos］i．e．yet you do not punish thein for their Briareus．

2．$\mu \in \rho \iota \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇nor because$ of this（i．e．of Thetis＇assistance）was anxious that Achilles should destroy many of the Greeks．＇Mept $\mu \nu \omega \bar{\nu} \tau \boldsymbol{a}$ should be in the infinitive，but may be considered to be influenced by the preceding $\tau v \chi \boldsymbol{u}^{\boldsymbol{b} \tau a}$ ．In any case the grammar is slovenly．The passage in Hom．Il．ii 3,4 runs
 $\phi \rho \in ́ v a$ wis＇A义ı入へ̂a
$\tau \iota \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$＇$\grave{\lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma a l ~ \delta ̀ ̀ ~} \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ a s ~ \epsilon ́ \pi i$ ขทvoiv＇A $\chi$ aıิ̂v．
Hence Ashton proffers the emen－ dation here oú $\delta \grave{\epsilon} ~ \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau a \quad \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \tau$ ．${ }^{\prime}$ ．＇A $\chi$ ．кal $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．Certainly the MS text appears suspicious； but oià roûto should probably be retained．

5．$\gamma^{\nu} \omega \rho i\lceil\{\mu \epsilon \nu]$＇we recognize．＇
26．Thirdly；the demons have inspired men who claim to be gods； their followers are called＇Christians＇； and perhaps it is through them that the slanders against us arise．And doctrines．

The third proof that Christianity is true is that those who at the demons＇bidding corrupt Christianity are not punished for their doctrines （whilst true Christians are）；there－ fore plainly the demons，the enemies of truth，are the authors of the persecutions．

The following passage is quoted by Eus．H．E．ii 13 ．

II．$\Gamma \iota \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］The name was Gitta or Gittae，not far from Flavia Nea－ polis，Justin＇s own birthplace．－ Simon appears to have come for－ ward，in Claudius＇reign，as a magician，and to have propounded a system mixed up of Jewish and Syro－Babylonian elements；he ap－ parently represented himself as a kind of emanation of the deity， and may have been honoured（in Samaria，if nowhere else）as an em－ bodiment of God＇s highest power． A woman named Helena appeared in his system as the world－creating

 үрафض̀v $\dot{\rho} \mu a і ̈ \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu \tau a v ́ \tau \eta \nu . ~ S I M O N I ~ D E O ~ S A N C T O . ~$ 3. каì $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \grave{o} \nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \Sigma a \mu a \rho \epsilon i \varsigma, ~ o ̉ \lambda i ́ \gamma o \iota ~ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ к а i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \nu ~$











 aủtò̀ Eus $H E$ III ${ }_{2} 6$
thought of God. But it is difficult to know how far Simon's doctrines and the history of his life have not been elaborated and garnished by the later heretics (there was a sect of Simonians in Justin's time) and by Catholics who treated Simon as the first heresiarch. The account in Acts viii 4 ff . seems to justify the belief that there was at least some tinge of rudimentary Gnosticism in his system (especially verse 10). It is not certain that Simon ever came to Rome.

1. $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\psi} T(\beta \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'In insula Tiberina.'
2. Simoni Deo Sancto] Subsequent authors, probably deriving their information from Justin, mention this statue, e.g. Iren. c. Haer. i 23, Tert. Ap. 13. Augustin. de Haer. I, and it is possible that statues in Simon's honour may have been erected at Samaria, and at Rome. This would not be singular, for Lucian describes extravagant honours that were paid to a similar
charlatan called Alexander. But it is, at the least, a curious coincidence that in the island of the Tiber was found the base of a statue inscribed Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio. Such dedications to the Sabine god Semo Sancus have been found elsewhere. And it is possible that Justin was deceived by such an inscription, and read it as a dedication Simoni Sancto Deo Filio. The ignorance of Latin on his part, which is thus supposed, would not be at all incredible. But we need not therefore doubt Justin's accuracy in respect of the honours paid to Simon at Samaria.
3. $\epsilon \pi i$ $\tau \epsilon$ yous $\sigma$.] According to Eusebius, she had been a prostitute at Tyre.
4. Evyotav] 'thought' or 'conception.'
5. M $\epsilon$ vavo $\delta \rho o \nu]$ A follower of Simon, he baptized in his own name, professing to confer a resurrection to eternal life and youth.
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unavoidably necessary after кai, and is supported by the reading in Eusebius.
6. ò $\quad$ òo yoûvtes] 'professing.'
7. Mapкiшעa] Also governed by $\pi \rho о є \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau 0$. Marcion's system conceived of two gods; one, the demiurge, was the God of the O.T., which Marcion rejected together with all Judaism: the other was the First God, who was found in the N.T., especially in the Pauline writings.

Cramer (Theol. Stud.) believes this passage and c. 58 to be later insertions: this one, he says, breaks the connexion, and Marcion did not call himself a god, as did Simon and Menander. But such a theory is doubtful. Justin would not be unlikely to take a chance of attacking Marcion, nor reluctant to
bracket him with other heresiarchs.
7. $\sigma v \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \psi \epsilon \omega$ ] 'assistance.'
11. $\omega^{\prime}$ हैं $\phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ] c. 7, 3 .
ib. ©iv то́тov oi] 'even as those philosophers (accepting Otto's insertion of $\epsilon \nu$ ) who do not share the same vieres are yet all called by one common name.' Otto, following Eusebius, alters $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \gamma$. to $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\kappa а \lambda о u ́ \mu \in \nu \circ \nu$, regarding the former word as being inserted from c. 7, where, in his opinion, it means 'adduced as an accusation.' But the word can mean, and normally does mean, simply 'predicated of somebody or something.' The Eusebian version of this passage is certainly more fluent, and may be correct. But it looks rather like a correction of an already corrupted text.




 бט́vтаүرа $\kappa a \tau \grave{~ \pi a \sigma \omega ̂ \nu ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ a i \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu ~ \sigma \nu \nu-~}$



 торуєía троáуоутаs, ои но́vоу тàs ко́раs ả入入à каì тоѝs

$6 \sigma \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu o \nu$ A om Eus $|\mid 8 \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ Stephan Otto $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \in \nu a$ $\delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{~A}$

1. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \dot{v} \sigma \phi \eta \mu a]$ especially promiscuity and cannibalism. Avzvias $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \rho o \pi \dot{\eta} \nu$ refers to the scandal that, at Christian meetings, a dog was tied to the lamp and excited. The lamp being thus overturned and extinguished, chance concubinage ensued. Cf. Min. Fel. Octau. p. 87.
2. àvéठ $\eta \nu$ ] 'promiscuously, without restraint.'
 2, ii 8 (3), 2.
3. кäv סı̀̀ $\tau$. $\delta$.$] 'at least for$ their opinions,' i.e. if they are punished at all, it is for their crimes. Christians alone are punished for their opinions. On $\kappa d y$ cf. c. 12, 3 note.
4. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu a \gamma \mu a]$ This work was probably known to Irenaeus. It is now lost.
5. $\dot{\epsilon \nu \tau v \chi \epsilon i v] ~ ' r e a d ' ~ a s ~ i n ~ c . ~ 14, ~}$ I.
6. We prohibit the exposure of children; (1) because such children are taken for vile uses, such as are practised commonly and openty among you, and even under the sanction of religion; whilst you
falsely accuse us of practising them in secret.

Justin does not make clear the connexion of cc. $27-29$ with the preceding arguments. Possibly he inserted this point with regard to the exposure of children, because it seemed to him important, without making any definite attempt to connect it with his general argument. But the point strengthens his argument for the unique truth of Christianity, by showing the moral purity of Christian practice in one notable example.

The exposure of children is denounced by many Church writers. Emperors like Trajan, Pius, Septimius Severus, tried to diminish this and similar evils, and to provide for the education of poor children. Constantine promulgated in A.D. 315 a law to restrain the practice in Italy.
9. $\pi$ ov$\eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ є $โ \nu a \iota]$ Cf. Didache


II. $\left.\pi \rho o d{ }^{2}{ }^{2} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau a s\right]$ Intransitive, 'growing up.'


















 $\theta \in \underset{\psi}{\mathrm{A}}$

1．$\phi \rho \rho \beta a ́ \delta \omega \nu]$＇grazing with the herd．＇
 understood．

4．＇̇ $\pi i$ toútov tô̂ drous］＇with a view to this abomination．＇

5．$\mu \omega \theta$ oús］Cf．Suet．Calig． 40. These were abolished by Justinian．

9．$\pi \rho \rho \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ย́ovtal］＇prostitute．＇
IO．єls кıvaiঠiav кт入．］Referring to the worship of the Asiatic mother of the gods and the eunuch priests of that cult．

12．ö $\phi \iota$ ］This hint is taken up in the next chapter．The snake played a prominent part in pagan－ ism，as the familiar genius of heroes and demigods，as the guardian of shrines，and in connexion with the cult of the dead．

15．$\phi \omega t o ̀ s ~ \theta \in i o ́ o u] ~ P a u t i g n y ~$
brackets $\theta$ 缓，and it certainly seems out of place and unnecessary， if the phrase goes with $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi$ ．It is possible however that the clause $\omega$ s．．．$\theta$ eiou ought to go with $\pi \rho a \tau \tau$ ．к．$\tau \iota \mu \dot{\omega} \mu$ ．and that the sense is that the heathen commit these sins openly，because the Divine light（i．e．of the Spirit）is perverted and absent in them．In that case there would be a sarcastic play upon words in ávarєт $\rho a \mu \mu \in ́ \nu o v$, which bears an allusion to the charge made against the Christians of入uxvias ajatpoтín $(26,7)$ ．The Christians are charged with over－ turning the material lamp for purposes of $\sin$ ；but the heathen sin openly，because the spiritual light is overturned in their case．

28．The snake which you rever－

















ence is with us the leader of the evil demons，who shall be punished eter－ nally．This event is postponed at present so as to give man a chance of repentance；for we have reason and intelligence and therefore no excuse for sin．To deny that God cares for man is equivalent to denying His existence，His character，or His nature，and removes any absolute－ ness of distinction between good and evil．

1．ठैфıs］Cf．Revel．xii 9 ठ
 кa入oúnevos $\Delta$ cáßoخos kal o Saravas． ib．xx．2；Genes．iii 1．The first trace of an explicit identification of Satan with the Serpent of the Fall narrative is found in Wisd．ii 24.

2．$\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \omega \nu]$ i．e．Christian．
4．кo入aбө $\eta \sigma o \mu$ évous］A not un－ common constructio ad sensum．

5．$\pi \rho \circ є \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ］Cf．Matt．xxv 41.

6．$\eta \epsilon \pi \mu$ ov $\quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] The same$
idea recurs in ii 6 （7）．
9．т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu]$＇originally．＇The same notion as in c．10， 4 ．

10．$\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu]$ may mean，as Otto takes it，＇to act rightly，＇or ＇to fare well，＇кai having the sense of＇and so．＇

If．ג́vaто入бүŋтov］Cf．Rom．i 20，21．For the construction cf． c． 3,5 ．

12．入оу七коl，$\theta \in \omega \rho \eta \tau \iota к о \ell]$＇capable of exercising reason and intelligence．＇

13．－$\mu \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \tau 0 u ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ i．e．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu$ ．
ib．\＃ो $\mu \dot{\eta}$ є［ขat кт $\lambda_{\text {．］}}$ ］The apo－ dosis begins at \＃\％．＇If he denies God＇s care for men，either he will by some artifice deny His existence，or，while allowing His existence，he will assert that He rejoices in evil，or that He remains unmoved like a stone，and etc．＇
 the Sophistic view，which Socrates and Plato attacked．Justin main－

















tains that to deny God＇s interest in human affairs removes the only absolute sanction for the distinction between good and evil．

29．We do not expose children （2）for fear they may consequently die．In fact，we marry to bring up children，or we do not marry and are continent．Contrast with our purity your deification of the profil－ gate Antinous．

The first reason for not exposing children was given in c． 27.

6．$\dot{\eta}$ à $\nu \epsilon \delta \eta \nu \mu \xi \xi \leqslant s]$ Cf．c． $25,7$.
ib．$\beta \iota \beta \lambda i \delta \iota \circ \nu$ à $\nu \in \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ］libellum obtulit（Otto）．

7．Фウ̈入ıкı］Felix was Praefectus Augustalis in Egypt．A papyrus records one C．Munatius Felix as prefect of Egypt in A．D．148－154． For the bearing of this fact on the date of the Apology，see Introd． p． 1 ．

9．$̇ \pi \iota \tau \rho o \pi \eta \hat{\eta}_{s}$ ］＇permission．＇Cas－ tration was forbidden by Roman law in the times of Nerva，Hadrian，
and Domitian．
10．itтorpá廿al］＇to subscribe，＇ i．e．to approve the request by his signature．
 with the testimony of his own con－ science and that of his fellore－ believers．＇

13．＇A $A \tau \tau \nu \delta o v]$ was a favourite of Hadrian，drowned in the Nile A．D． I 30 （ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ）．Hadrian deified him．

14．סıà $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta o v]$ Eusebius＇read－ ing，$\delta i \dot{\alpha}$ $\phi \delta \beta o y$ ，is supported by Athanas．c．Gent．9，who says men honour Antinous סıà фóß̧ov tov̂ $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau d \xi a v \tau o s$. Athenagoras how－ ever（Leg．30，âddressed to Aurelius and Commodus）says it was dune $\phi \iota \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \not \subset \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \nu \rho \sigma \gamma \sigma \nu \omega \nu$ ． The difference of reading here is not important，but סià $\phi \delta \beta$ ov can stand as $=$＇with fear，＇i．e．＇they feared and reverenced＇Antinous． Cf．oì alōoûs＇respectfully．＇After all，too，it would not be specially to Justin＇s purpose to assert that
 $\hat{\eta} \rho \chi \epsilon \nu$.









31. 1. "A $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ ot oûv $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon \varsigma$ èv ’Iovóaioıs $\gamma \in \gamma \in ́ \nu \eta \nu \tau a \iota$







## 3 elm $\eta$ Otto om A

Antinous was reverenced only out of fear of Hadrian.

1. $\left.\tau i s \tau \varepsilon \bar{\eta}_{\nu}\right]$ So Athanas. loco.
 oú $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \epsilon i a s{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \omega$.
2. You may say that Christ was a mere man, and a magician, but the argument from prophecy will disprove that theory.

Here Justin passes to the second subject announced in c. 23, viz. that Christ Jesus is the Son of God.
7. Toîs $\lambda \in ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota]$ i.e. not trusting to those who tell about Christ Himself.
8. tois $\pi \rho \circ ф \eta т$ éovą $]$ This is the argument from prophecy in the most literal sense, which points to the correspondence between forecast and event. Note that Justin does not refer to Christ's miracles as a proof of His Divinity, because
it was possible to retort that miraculous works could be the product of magic; but true prophecy was admitted by the pagans to be a sure sign of Divine inspiration.
31. A short sketch of Hebrew prophecy and of the LXX translalion. In these prophecies are plain foretellings of Christ's life and of the Christian Church's expansion.
18. $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon i \pi o \nu]$ 'treated with great heed, "from $\pi \epsilon \rho, \epsilon \neq \pi \omega$.
ib. Ito 入є $\mu a i ̂ o s]$ Ptolemy Philadelphus B.C. $285-247$. The insertion of Herod's name is a plain anachronism. Attempts have been made to exempt Justin from the charge of error by altering the text, or by treating 'H $\omega \dot{\omega} \delta \eta$ and 'H $\rho \omega \dot{\delta} \eta$ s as the glosses of an ignorant annotator (in which case $\delta \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u$ s would be the high-priest) ; it has also been tug-

 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ оऽ каi $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau о$ र́т $\omega \nu, \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega}$







 то̂̂ $\delta \epsilon \hat{v} \rho о$, каi $\pi a \nu \tau a \chi o \hat{v} \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma i ́ \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu ~ ' I o v \delta a i o ı s, ~ o ̂ ̀ ~$







 $\mu \epsilon \nu \pi \rho о \kappa \eta \rho v \sigma \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu \pi a \rho a \gamma \iota \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu, \gamma \in \nu \nu \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$ Sıà тaן-

 $\chi 0 \chi \in \beta a s$ A \|| 20 áná $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ A ad $\gamma \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ Eus
gested that Justin has confused Prolemy's foundation of the library with Cleopatra's restoration of it in the Serapeum. Perhaps it is most simple to suppose Justin to be guity either of ignorance or of a lapse of memory. Justin's account of the LXX translation (excluding the reference to Herod) seems based upon the well-known story of Aristeas, though he does not mention the romantic and miraculous details which formed part of the usuat version.
17. B $\alpha \rho \chi \omega \chi \in \beta a s]$ The revolt of Barcochba took place A.D. 132-135. Justin's use of $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is quite loose. Cf. 29, 4 'Avctvóou тô̂ עû̀ $\gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \eta$ $\mu \in ́ v o v$, and 42,4 ó ка日' $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s^{\prime} I \eta \sigma o u ̂ s$
 $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi{ }^{\alpha}{ }^{\circ} \quad \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 s$.
20. Єv́pouє $]$ ] 'we have found.' The aorist is not easy to account for.
21. $\pi \rho о к \eta \rho \nu \sigma \sigma b \mu \in \nu о \nu \pi а \rho a \gamma \iota \nu \delta-$ $\mu \in \nu \circ \nu]$ 'foretold as coming.'
22. $\theta \in \rho a \pi \epsilon$ и́ovta кт入.] Cf, Matt. iv 23 ; ix 35 ; $\times 1$.

тâбav $\mu a \lambda a \kappa i ́ a \nu ~ к a i ̀ ~ \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho o u ̀ s ~ a ̀ \nu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i ́ \rho o \nu \tau а, ~ к а i ̀ ~ \phi \theta o \nu o u ́-~$










32. I. М $\omega u ̈ \sigma \hat{\eta} \varsigma \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o ̂ ̂ \nu, ~ \pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \tau o \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu o ́-$








 $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa о \hat{v} \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s ~ \delta u i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ М \omega u ̈ \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega s ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ e ̀ к \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \epsilon \iota \nu$

## 

 ie. than the Jews.
 dates are obviously intended to be merely approximate. The earliest may be intended for Moses (whom Justin calls the first of the prophets in c. 32, 1) or Adam. It is not worth while to attempt to fix the reference of the later dates to any particular prophets.
10. катd $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ т as $\delta \iota a \delta$.] 'in sucessive generations.'
32. O.T. passages prophetic of Christ.
13. auto $\lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon$ !] 'in express terms.' The quotation is from Gen. xix IO, 11 .
14. $\dot{\psi} \dot{\pi} \pi \kappa \kappa \epsilon \iota \tau a \iota]$ sc. $\tau \delta \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \iota \circ \nu$, as Justin subsequently explains. Cf. Tryph. 120, where he insists that this is the correct reading, as opposed to the normal LXX text тд̀ àтокєє $\mu$ éva auer $\hat{\text { 人 }}$.
19. $\mu \in ́ \chi \chi \iota ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \phi a \nu] ~ J u s t i n ~ t r a c e s$. a providential connexion between the subjugation of Judaea and the birth of Christ, and similarly between the crucifixion of Christ and the fall of the Jewish state.
 ßaбìtcov. 3. 'Iov́ $\delta a s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \pi \rho o \pi a ́ t \omega \rho ~ ' I o v \delta a i ́ \omega v, ~ a ̀ \phi ' ~$

























15. $\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda \frac{0}{} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The reference is plainly to Matt. xxi Iff.,
 $\delta \in \delta \epsilon \mu \notin \nu o s$ does not occur in the canonical Gospels, nor does Justin inclucle this particular in Tryph. 53, where the same passage of Genesis is similarly interpreted. The detail may be traditional, or may be a
gloss of Justin's, suggested to him by the O. T. passage.
20. тò $\lambda \in i ̂ \pi o \nu] ~ C f . ~ 52, ~ 2 ~ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\lambda \epsilon i \pi=\nu \tau a$.
23. $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ alı $^{\prime \prime}$ atos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A reference to the atoning power of Christ's death.
26. $\tau 亠$ ò $\sigma \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha$, ò $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s]$ Cf. I John ii 14 ; iii 9 .
 ả入入’є̇к $\theta \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma . ~ I O . ~ \dot{\eta} \delta є ̀ ~ \pi \rho \omega ́ т \eta ~ \delta u ́ v a \mu \iota s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$ тòv татє́ра та́עтшע каi $\delta \in \sigma \pi о ́ т \eta \nu ~ \theta є o ̀ \nu ~ \kappa а i ~ v i o ̀ s ~ o ́ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~$





 Іо $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon v ́ \omega \nu$ ои́ $\tau \omega \varsigma \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu$ ．＇А $\nu a \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ä $\sigma \tau \rho о \nu$＇$\xi$＇$І а \kappa \omega ́ \beta$ ，каі̀




 $\delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon ́ v o v ~ ' I o v \delta a i ́ \omega \nu ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s, ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \theta \epsilon o ̂ ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon-~$

 viós $\dot{\sim} \pi \eta \hat{\rho} \chi \chi{ }^{\epsilon}$ ．


 rє́ $\xi \in \tau a \iota$ vió $\nu, \kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \rho o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \pi i ~ \tau \hat{\varphi}$ óvó $\mu a \tau \iota$ aủтov̂ $\mathrm{M} \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ó $\theta \epsilon o ́ s . ~ 2 . ~ \grave{a ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \eta ̉ \nu ~ a ̈ \pi \iota \sigma \tau а ~ к а i ̀ ~ a ́ \delta v ́ v a \tau а ~ \nu о \mu \iota \zeta ' ~} \mu \epsilon \nu a$




2．$\grave{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta$ $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu c s]$ This is a case of logical precedence．It is unfair to read any Arian idea in it． See Introd．，p．xxii．

Io．divarє $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Numb． xxiv 17；Isa．xi 1 ， 10 ；li 5. Justin has here contaminated a prophecy of Isaiah with a passage from the Pentateuch．

33．O．T．prophecies of the Virgin－Birth．The Virgin－Birth explained and distinguished from pagan myths．

22．Lóov́］Cf．Isa．vii 14 ；Matt： ${ }^{1} 23$.

26．Iขa 8таע кт入．］Cf．John xiv 29 and above c． 12 ， 10.




 $\sigma \iota a \sigma \theta \epsilon i ̄ \sigma a \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi a \rho \theta \in ́ v o \nu ~ \sigma \nu \lambda \lambda a \beta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \cdot \epsilon i ̉ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma v \nu o v \sigma \iota a ́ \sigma \theta \eta$






 $\sigma \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \lambda a o ̀ \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̂ ~ a ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ́ \mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega ̂ \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, $\hat{\omega} \varsigma$ oi

 ${ }^{'} \mathrm{H} \sigma a \hat{้} 0 \cup$ то仑 $\pi \rho \circ \delta \in \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu$ évov тò $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ тov̂tov




 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ A $||~ I 7 ~ \tau o u ̂ \tau o \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu ~ A ~ \tau o u ̂ \tau o ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu ~ O t t o ~ \|| ~$
 is 'Hzatas ó $\pi \rho o \delta$. Grab al
6. бu入haßeiv] A technical word for 'to conceive.'
8. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa\{a \sigma \epsilon \nu]$ Cf. Luke i 35 .
 dative of the person preached to is found in classical Greek ; the accusative is common in the N. T., e.g. Luke iii 18; Acts viii 25 , and the passive, meaning 'to have the Gospel preached to one,' occurs in Matt. xi 5 ; Heb. iv 2, 6.
ib. iסov̀ $\sigma u \lambda \lambda \eta \psi^{2} \psi$ ] Cf. Luke i 31, 32; Matt. i 20, 21. There is possibly, but not necessarily, a
reference to the Protevangel. ix I $_{4}$, where a similar combination isgiven.
18. $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu]$ used in the passive sense. Liddell and Scott refer to a parallel in Diod. xix 2

ib. Tò $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a]$ Justin does not clearly discriminate between the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ and the $\lambda$ bros. See Introd., p. xxviii.
20. $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ б́токоs] See above c. 23.
21. Mwüन $\hat{s}$ ] If this reading is kept, the infinitive elvat must be understood with $\theta \epsilon \mu$ ss indeclinable.




















The reference is to c. $32,9,10$, where from the Mosaic passage it was inferred that the $\lambda 6$ रos was the súvauls of God (not that he was $\pi \rho \omega$ тотокоs, so that the reading $\dot{\omega}$ M $\omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ is incorrect). There is no reference here to the passage of Isaiah, so that there is no need to accept the ingenious suggestion that ws $\hat{\eta}$ s (abbreviated for $\dot{\eta} \sigma a i a s)$ was the original reading, and was changed into M $\omega \sigma \hat{\eta}$ s.
2. Tò סé'Inбoûs] Cf. ii 5 (6), 4 .
8. $\lambda 6 \gamma \varphi$ 暗 $i(\psi]$ In the broad sense of 'God's word.'
34. O. T. prophecy as to the place of Christ's birth.
II. кal ó $\mathrm{B} \eta \theta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu]$ Cf. Mic. v 2; Matt. ii 6. The quotation follows so closely the interpretative form of St Matthew that it cannot be referred to any other source.
13. кஸ́رиך $\delta \epsilon \in \tau i s ~ \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ Bethlehem
is about five miles south of Jerusalem. Thirty-five stades is about four English miles.
16. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\omega} \nu]$ The $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \gamma \rho a \phi a l$ are the census.returns, which would probably be preserved in the Roman archives.
17. Kvpŋviov] Quirinius was legatus of Syria (not procurator of Judaea, so that $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota r \rho 6 \pi r o v$ is not technically correct) in A.D. 6, but had hefl some post in Syria previously, perhaps B.C. 5-3 or earlier. Cf. Luke ii 2, and Ramsay, Was Christ born at Bethlehem?, where the whole subject, which bristles with chronological difficulties, is discussed. The $\pi \rho \omega$ tov looks as if Justin read $\pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau o v$ (not $\pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta$ ) $\eta \gamma є \mu о \nu \epsilon$ v́ovтоs in his text of St Luke.
35. $O$. T. prophecies about Christ's sufferings.




















$14 \Delta a v t \delta$ edd $\delta \alpha \bar{\delta} \mathrm{A}$

I. ẳ $\rho \stackrel{\text { cs }}{\mathrm{a} \nu \delta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}] \text { ' until He had }}$ become a man,' i.e. up to His Crucifixion; not up to His Baptism, for the account of the Crucifixion follows immediately. "Axpıs aं $\nu \delta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}$ means 'up to manhood and into it.' It is somewhat strange, however, that the suggestion of $\lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ is not worked out by quoting Is3. liii 1, 2, or similar passages.
3. $\pi$ aiठьov кт $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] Cf. Isa. ix 6.
 Isa. lxv 2; 1viii 2.
12. $\delta i$ é $\tau \in ́ \rho o v ~ \pi \rho o \phi . ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon l] ~ s c . ~$ то̀ $\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau є к \grave{\nu} \pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$.
ib. aủtol $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Ps. xxi 17 , 19 (xxii 16,18 ).
14. $\delta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta$ aut $\delta]$ Only the last quotation was from 'David.' It is a natural piece of carelessness.
15. є́छॄєтáӨ $\eta$ ràs $\chi \in i p a s]$ ' had His
hands stretched out.'
18. סıaбט́povtєs aủt. ̇̇кá $\theta \iota \sigma \alpha \nu]$ ' in mockery they set Him on the. judgment seat.' This detail is found not in the canonical Gospels but in a fragment of the 'Gospel of Peter'



 тô 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta$ 'n, where see Dr Swete's note, and his discussion on p. xxxiii f. Harnack contends that Justin used this gospel, Krüger (Early Christ. Lit. § 16) declares it to be 'quite improbable.' Justin's statement here might be a traditional account, or, if he used the 4 th Gospel, might be an interpretation of $\epsilon \kappa \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ in John xix 13 .



















$8 \pi \rho о є \pi є \phi$ ท́тєито Thalemann $\pi \rho о є ф$ ท́тєито A
 35 and parallel passages.
6. äкт $\omega \nu$ ] The Acta of Pontius Pilate (referred to also in c. 48,3 ) would be an official document, probably not seen by Justin, but supposed by him to be in the official archives. It has nothing to do with the apocryphal Acts of Pilate. But see the discussion in Stanton Gosp. as Hist. Docs. I P. 102 .
7. 户̀ $\eta$ т̂s] ' expressly.'
9. Eopovlou] The quotation is not from Zephaniah but from Zech. ix 9. Cf. Matt. xxi 5. It is a slip of memory, and the same quotation is rightly ascribed to Zechariah in Tryph. 53 .
36. Inspired prophecies are given
in different ways. Sometimes the Spiril prophesies in person, sometimes as in God's person, or Christ's, or man's. The Jews failed to recoornize this.

A parenthetic chapter to explain that, though prophecies may differ in the manner of their presentation, they are all the work of the same Spirit, here called $\delta \quad \theta \in \hat{i} o s ~ \lambda o ́ y o s . ~$ See Introd., p. xxviil.
 person of someone.'
16. $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \kappa \bar{s}]$ i.e. prophetic declarations of the Spirit Himself. Cf. c. 39 .
17. à $\pi$ ò $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$. Tồ $\theta \in o \hat{u}]$ сc. 37, 44.
19. ג. $\pi$. r. X $\rho$ เбто仑ि] сс. $38,49$.
ib. d. $\pi . \lambda a \omega \nu$ ] cc. 47,53 .
















 pavós $\mu \circ \iota$ Өрóvos，каì $\dot{\eta}$ र̂̀ $\dot{\eta} \pi о \pi o ́ \delta \iota o \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \mu o v . ~$



 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．7．к $\hat{a} \nu$ ф＇́ $\rho \eta \tau \epsilon \quad \sigma \epsilon \mu i \delta a \lambda \iota \nu, \theta v \mu i a \mu a, \beta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda v \gamma \mu \hat{a}^{3}$
 троб̈́mov тồ $\pi$ atpos Otto Kruger

2．Ěva $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \kappa \lambda$ ．］＇The composer of the whole work is one man，but he brings forward characters conversing．＇

5．oủסє̀ Tapayєעómevov］＇not even after His advent．＇

8．$\mu$ 水论 $\nu$ ］Cf．c． $3 \mathrm{I}, 5$ ．
37．Instances of prophecies spoken by the Looos through a prophet as in the person of God．

II．єै $\gamma \nu \omega \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Isaiah i 3． 4.

16．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \tau 0 \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho b s]$ The change which Otto suggests is an obvious one，and corruption would have
been easy from the homoioteleuton $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \dot{\pi} 0 \cup$ rov̂．But it is not abso－ lutely certain that Justin might not have used ámó as＝ámò $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega ́ \pi o v$, after his first use of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \dot{\omega}^{-}$ nov in the beginning of the chapter．

17．$\pi$ ồo кт入．］Cf．Isaiah lxvi r．
19．$\tau$ às vovuŋvias $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf． Isaiah i．II－15，lviii．6，7．Ap－ parently a quotation from memory， in which two passages are com－ bined．

23．$\sigma \epsilon \mu i \delta a \lambda \iota \nu]$＇fine wheaten four．


 ßıaíw $\sigma \nu \nu a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, ä $\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma о \nu \kappa a i ̀ ~ \gamma \nu \mu \nu o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma \kappa є ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon, ~ \delta \iota a ́-~$ 5 Өрvாтє $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \omega ̂ \nu \tau \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ a ̆ \rho \tau о \nu ~ \sigma o v . ~ 9 . ~ о ́ т о і ̂ a ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o ̂ ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \tau ८ ~$ $\kappa а i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ảmò то̂́ $\theta \in o \hat{v}, \nu о \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ $\delta v ́ v a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.

 10 тàs $\chi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \rho a ́ s ~ \mu o v ~ \epsilon ่ \pi i ̀ ~ \lambda a o ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon \iota \theta o v ̂ \nu \tau a ~ \kappa a i ~ a ̉ \nu \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma о \nu \tau а, ~ \epsilon ’ \pi i ~$ тоѝs торєvo $\mu \in ́ \nu o v s ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ o ́ \delta ̣ ̂ ~ o v ̉ ~ к a \lambda \eta ̂ . ~ 2 . ~ к а i ~ \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu . ~ T o ̀ \nu ~$













 Otto om örı A reqovéval Grab
3. orpar $\gamma a \lambda c a s$ ] a late form of otparya入ls 'a knot,' 'the knots of violent dealings?
6. $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ रov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}]$ See note above.
38. Prophecies spoken as in Christ's person.

if. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \nu \omega ̄ \tau o \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah 1. 6-8.
18. aútoí $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ps. xxi. 19, 17 (xxii 18, 16 ).
19. $̇$ 'ỳ̀ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Ps. iii 6(5)$.

2I. Ė $\lambda \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu \kappa т \lambda$.] Ps. xxi 8, 9 (xxii 7,8 ).
22. äтıva $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Matt. xxvii 39-43.
23. Mattiv $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Presumably he means from the Acta of Pilate.

 үєípas $\rho \cup \sigma a ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ éavtóv.
39. I. "Oтav $\delta 仑 ̂$ ©́s $\pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{v} o \nu ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau a ~ \gamma i ́-~$









 ن́тò tô $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \frac{v}{} \delta \iota \delta a ́ \xi a \iota ~ \pi a ́ \nu t a s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu . ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~$


 $\sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu$. 4. $\delta v \nu a \tau o ̀ v ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \eta ु \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu ~$
'Н $\gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma$ ' о́ $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu о к є \nu, \dot{\eta} \delta_{\epsilon} \phi \rho \eta ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \nu \dot{\prime} \mu о т о \varsigma ~$

## $19 \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ edd. $\gamma \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha \mathrm{A}$

39. A prophecy of the future, spoken directly by the Spirit Himself, and fulfilled in the spread and influence of Christianity.
40. $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \Sigma_{\imath \omega \omega} \kappa \kappa \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah ii 3,4 ; Mic. iv 2 .
41. Sißúvas] 'spears.' The ordinary form is $\sigma \iota \beta i v \eta$.
 ber is used as an official title for the Twelve, who were the original heads of the Church. The omission of St Paul's name is therefore quite natural ; some have explained it by the fact that Justin chiefly used the gospel record; some have supposed that St Paul is tacitly included in the Twelve in place of St James who was killed by Herod; Veil suggests that the early Church was unable to understand the Pauline theology
and made little of its author. But these surmises are unnecessary in the case of Justin.
42. $\langle\delta \iota \omega$ тal] Cf. Acts iv $\{3$.
43. à $\pi \in \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\lambda} \eta \sigma a \nu \ldots \pi a ̊ \nu \tau a s]$ Cf. Matt. xxviii 19.
44. Tòv $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \in \circ \hat{v} \lambda$ brov] 'The word of God,' meaning the gospel. Cf. Acts vi 2.
45. oi $\pi \dot{d} \lambda a \iota ~ \kappa т \lambda$.] Cf. c. I4, 2, 3 .
 not to utter falsehood or deceive our inquisitors.'
 The quotation is from Eur. Hipp. 612 (of course the last syllable of $\delta \mu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu о к є \nu$ ought to be elided) and the sentiment had already been burlesqued in Aristoph. Ran. 101, 1471; Thesmoph. 275.

Toteî̀ $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ \varsigma ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o u ̂ t o . ~$





 тоӨой $\mu \in \nu a$ тарà тô̂ $\delta$ vva $\mu$ évov סov̂vaı $\lambda a \beta \epsilon i ̂ v$.









 रíras $\delta \rho a \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ódóv. 5. трòs тоútous סè каì 入óyшv





## I $\eta^{\circ} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ Otto $\eta ้ \delta \eta \mathrm{~A}$

2. Tò's $\sigma v \nu \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon{ }^{2} \nu$ ous $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'covenanted and enrolled.' The reference is to the military sacramentum. Cf. Aul. Gell. xvi 4 for the formula. Suet. Calig. I5 says Gaius added to the oath ' neque me liberosque meos cariores habebo quam Gaium habeo et sorores eius.' Veil sees here a reminiscence of Socrates' argument in Plat. Ap. 28 b, where Socrates draws an analogy between his loyalty to earthly generals and his loyalty to his divine commander.
3. $\pi a \tau \rho l \delta o s]$ The word is unexpected and may be wrong. Ashton

## suggests $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$.

40. O.T. prophecies of the preaching of the Appostles. Also a general forecast of certain Christian facts.
41. то̂́ $\pi \rho о є \iota \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu O \nu)$ in c. $35,6$.
42. ǹuépa kт入.] Cf. Ps. xviii 3 (xix 2) ff., Rom. x 18.
43. ои́к єiซl $\lambda a \lambda เ a l ~ к т \lambda$.] 'There are no languages nor words, in which their voices are not heard.'
44. $\pi a \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}] ~ ' b r i d a l ~ c h a m b e r . ' ~$
ib. ©'s rivas] Similarly quoted in Tryph. 64. In Ap. i 54,9 it is loxuods ís riras. Emendation is uncalled for.

 ढ่тiтрótou oùv тoîs aùtoû $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega ́ \tau a \iota \varsigma ~ \kappa a \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o u ̂ ~$





















3．є̇пıтро́тov］Cf．с．13， 3.
4．$\sigma v \nu \epsilon \hat{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu]$ Cf．Acts iv 27.
ib．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ढ́к $\pi$ тavtòs $\gamma \in ́ \nu o u s] ~ C f . ~$ c． 1 ．

6．$\epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \alpha l]$＇has promised．＇
7．oi $\delta a i \mu o v e s$ ］Presumably Justin reads an allusion to them in the ${ }^{*} \theta \nu \eta, \lambda \alpha o l, \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \varepsilon i ̂ s ~ a n d ~$ áp $\chi$ ovtes of the following quota－ tion．

11．Maкd́ptos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Cf．Ps．i，ii，$ which are treated as one Psalm． Cf．Acts xiii 33 and Tischendorf＇s critical note．

13．$\lambda o \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ from the adjective入ou $\mu$＇s $=$＇pestilent．＇
ib．di $\lambda \lambda$＇$\left.{ }^{\prime}\right]$ literally＇except＇；－－ Liddell and Scott derive it from $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \ddot{\eta}$ ，the accent of $\ddot{a} \lambda \lambda o$ having been lost．It comes to mean simply ＂but，＂as here and in § 10 ád入 $\eta$ $\dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon l \chi \chi^{\nu} 0$ ûs．

18．катєvod $\omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota]$＇shall be prospered．＇

19．$\chi$ voûs］＇foam，＇the＇fine down＇on flower or fruit（but also ＇dust，＇see L．and Sc．）．

23．¿фри́aそ̇av］Фрvátroual is a classical word meaning＇to neigh， to be wanton．＇The active is found only in LXX and N．T．
$\lambda a o i ~ \epsilon ่ \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ т \eta \sigma a \nu ~ к а \iota \nu a ́ ; ~ \pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu ~ o i ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̂ \varsigma ~ \gamma \eta ̂ s, ~$



















 $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \pi \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ $\delta i \mathfrak{i}$ av̉тố $\Delta a v i \ell$, öт $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \tau a v \rho \omega-$



I. кalvá] The accepted reading is $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ á, but eight mss of the LXX have кaldá.
41. An O.T. prophecy of the reign of Christ.
23. q̆ $\sigma a \tau \varepsilon \kappa \pi \lambda$.] Cf. I Chron. xvi $23,25-31$ and Ps. xcv (xcvi) 1, 2. 4-10. The psalm is quoted fully in Tryph. 73. Justin's text exhibits many variations from the text of I Chronicles: thus he has ei $\bar{\delta} \omega \lambda a$ סacuovicu for elin $\omega \lambda$ (the LXX version of the psalm gives $\delta a \iota \mu b \nu i a$
in verse 5), $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi a \tau \rho l ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aiću $\nu \omega$ for ai matplà $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \omega \hat{\nu}, \chi$ रápıl for $\delta \omega \hat{\rho} a$, and $\alpha \pi \dot{o}$ roû $\xi \dot{v} \lambda{ }^{2} o v$ is added. Veil considers these differences, especially the last, too significant to be slips of memory, and surmises that an edition of this psalm was used, with these alterations, in Christian worship. It is worth remarking that, according to Eus. H. E. iv 18, Justin edited a $\psi \dot{d} \lambda$ т $\eta$ s.








 тô̂ $\xi u$ ú $o v$.











7. $\phi о \beta \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'let the whole earth fear before His face and be set right and not be moved.' The verse following in the original, which describes the joy of nature at God's adrent, is here omitted; thus the idea becomes ethical, a summons to repentance ( $\kappa \alpha \tau о \rho \theta \omega-$ $\theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega)$ as a condition of not being disturbed.
42. You note that in some of these passages the future is spoken of in the past tense; but the fulfilment comes only in Christ. A parenthesis to explain the wording of some prophecies.
13. àmo入oyiav] 'an excuse' for misunderstanding and therefore disbelieving in Christian teaching. The
idea is the same as in c. 3,4 .
15. $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \mu \dot{\nu} \nu a \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a]$ going together, 'Known as future.'
16. èvateviбate] 'look carefully.'
17. Єै $\tau \in \sigma \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] David's reign may roughly be dated 1000 B.C. There may be some mistake in the figures of Justin's text, and some emend $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau а к о \sigma i o s ~ t o ~ \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta ́ к о \nu \tau \alpha . ~$ But Justin's chronology is very loose.
19. єủфробúv $\nu \downarrow$ ] referring back to ev̉ф $\rho a \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ in c. $4 \mathbf{1}, 4$.
20. ذ ка日' $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s} s]$ Noster (Otto). In unserer Zeit (Veil). The latter seems more natural ; it is a careless chronological expression, but quite in keeping with Justin's manner.


 $\mu^{\prime} \nu \eta \nu$ v่ $\pi^{\prime}$ av̉тồ ả $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a \nu$.














## 

43. Nor does Divine foreknowledge lessen human responsibility or do away with human freewill. We see men acting inconsistently, which is not compatible with the action of fate. And, if all actions were predestined, moral judgments would be a matter of mere convention, which view reason rejects as immoral. The consequences of actions are fated, but the actions themselves are free.

Justin is led on from c. 42 ( $\epsilon_{\kappa} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \rho 0 \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ ) to anticipate and refute Fatalistic inferences from the belief in Divine foreknowledge. His arguments may be summed up as follows: (1) Fatalism means the renunciation of all human responsibility, and all moral judgments. (2) Men act inconsistently, which is scarcely possible except by the exercise of free-will. (3) Reason
declares an essential distinction between right and wrong. (4) Ineluctable fate decrees the rewards and punishments of actions, not the actions themselves.-Thus Justin scarcely reconciles Divine foreknowledge with human free-will, but confines himself to refuting Fatalism.
7. $\pi \rho \circ є \iota \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \nu a]$ 'foretell things foreknown.'
8. $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho i a s . . . \kappa o \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s]$ According to Aristot. Rhet. i io ri $\mu \omega \rho \mathrm{p}$ a is vindictive, к $\delta \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota s$ is corrective in idea.
10. $\mu a \theta \delta \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$ каl кт入.] 'We learn from the prophets and assert as true.'
12. To 的' $\dot{\eta} \mu i \hat{\nu}]$ ' free choice.'
ib. $\epsilon l$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ є $\ell \mu a \rho \tau a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This is the first of the four arguments enumerated above.

























 prove as follows.' There follows the second argument, from the inconsistencies of human action.
3. $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \nu \nu]$ 'pursuit.'
4. oủk äy $\pi$ тотє] This deduction is not logical; inconsistency might be predestined, as much as consistency. $\quad \Delta \epsilon \kappa т \iota \kappa$ 's $=$ 'capable of,' Lat. capax.
8. ג́ $\pi о ф а \imath \nu o[\mu \in \theta a]$ 'we should have to affirm.' A conditional optative, like $\delta \delta \xi$ दı, below.
ib. Éкєìvo тd $\pi \rho \circ \in \iota \rho \eta \mu \notin ้ o \nu]$ in c. 28,4 .
11. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ خ̀s $\lambda 6$ रos] The third argument, an appeal to reason.
12. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ єiцариє́ $\nu \eta \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The fourth argument.
14. Є' $\pi \backslash \chi \epsilon \iota \rho a]$ 'reward,' usually of punishment, as here.
ib. oú $\gamma \dot{\text { á }}$ ] The text here, as quoted in the Sacra Parallela, is given in full in the critical note.
18. toûto $\gamma \in \nu$ buevos] 'havingbeen born so,' i.e. ára0bs.















 үàp $\sigma$ то́ $\mu a$ кирíov є่ $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon ~ \tau а и ̂ \tau a . ~$

5．тò $\delta$ ѐ т тоєє $\eta$－




 $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \epsilon \mu \nu о v ́ \sigma \eta s$ каi av̉тіка ג̇та入入аббои́бทs $\mu a \chi a i ́ \rho a s$
$4 \mathbf{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s$（et infr $\left.\mathbf{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \omega s \ldots \mathbf{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\eta} s\right)$ edd $\mathbf{M} \omega \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \omega s . . . \mathbf{M} \omega \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ A \｜


44．Moses and Isaiah each assume the fact of frec－zwill；as cloes I＇luto，who，like other（ircek philosophers and poets，derived some of his ideas from the Old Testament． The demons huale instigated the prohibition to read the books of prophry．liut aee Cilvistians rad them and try to persuade you by their means．

5．iõoíкт入．｜Cf．Deut．xxx I5， II）but the command is not there addressed lo Adam．I＇ossibly Justin is confusing it with（ien．11．16， 17.

7．$\dot{\omega} s ~ a ̀ \pi \delta ~ \tau o \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho b ́ s] ~ F o r ~ t h e ~$ reading of．c．37， 3 and note．

8．єis roûto］＇with this object，＇ ＇in this sense．＇
9．$\lambda \epsilon \chi \theta$ クुval $\rceil$ Justin has pro－ halbly forgotten how his sentence began．
ih．$\lambda \frac{1}{\prime} \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］C．f．Isaiah i 16－20．

20．tò $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ ］So Clem．Alex． Protrept 95 guotes the passage $\mu a ́ \chi \alpha u p a ~ i \mu a ̂ s ~ к а i ~ \pi i ̂ p ~ к а т t i ́ s e t a l . ~$
 to Veil the sense is＇rohich cuts and







 $\pi а \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \rho \mu а т а ~ a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \delta о к є \hat{\imath ̂ ~ \epsilon i v a l \cdot ~ e ̀ \lambda e ́ \gamma \chi о \nu т a \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~}$
 $\gamma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. II. $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ö $\phi a \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \grave{a} ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda-$




> ${ }_{15} \pi a \rho^{\prime}$ aủróv Otto $\pi a \rho \rho^{\prime}$ aủrôv A fortasse $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ aúrov̂
so alters life at once'; according to Maran 'which cuts and then at once lets go.' The latter is far more natural. The contrast on either rendering is between the quick action of a $\mu$ áxalpa and the gradual process implied in катєঠєтa..

1. П入а́т $\omega \nu$ ] Rep. x 617 e, but without the $\delta^{3}$.
2. $\lambda a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu \in\lceil\pi \epsilon]$ This theory had previously been suggested by the Jewish Peripatetic Aristobulus and Philo. In some moods Iustin adopts the view of the Spermatic Logos existing among the heathen (e.g. ii 10,2 ); but he seems unconscious of any inconsistency.
3. $\theta \in \omega \rho$ las oupaviliv] 'the contemplation of celestial things,' with special reference to the myth in the Phaedrus.
4. סó $\gamma \mu a \tau$ os övтos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A very awkward sentence. The usual interpretation is 'since it is God's decree, as He intends to reward... that His rewards should be equivalent to the merit of the deeds';
though Veil suggests that $\mu \in \lambda \lambda_{\text {ovia }}$ should go with ėкaбтov, 'each man that is to be.' But the whole sentence, so taken, seems very unnatural. It may be simpler to read $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ aủroû (instead of $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ aúròv) going with what follows, and render 'since it is one of our tenets that each man shall receive from Him according to his deeds.' The next clause might conceivably mean 'and (that each man shall) meet the things which proceed from himself' (cf. 2 Cor. v io), though I can find no parallel to such an accus. with $\dot{a} \pi a \nu \tau a ̂ \nu$; or 'that God's awards shall occur according to the merit of the deeds.' For the absolute use of $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \nu \tau \hat{a} \nu$ in this last rendering cp. Clem. Al. Strom. vii p. $870 \pi \rho$ òs tòv aủròv àmavтầ xpoyov. It is not uncommon in Origen; e.g. Philoc. xviii 3 (Robinson) Tis ràp... $\hat{\rho} \ell \pi \tau \epsilon \iota$ тà $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau a \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$,
 $\sigma \in \sigma \theta a r ;$ In any case the sentence is somewhat tautologous.
 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \rho a \tau \tau о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ả $\pi a \nu \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\delta \iota \alpha ̀$ то̂ $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa о \hat{v} \pi \nu \epsilon u ́-$


 Saıнóvமv $\theta a ́ \nu a \tau o s ~ \grave{\omega} \rho i \sigma \theta \eta$ катà т̂̂v тàs $\Upsilon \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \pi o v ~ \hat{\eta}$





 $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu \in \dot{v} \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau a ́ \phi a \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \cdot \kappa a ̂ \nu$ ỏ $\lambda_{i ́ \gamma o u s ~ \delta e ̀ ~}^{\epsilon \epsilon i ́ \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \grave{a}}$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \tau а ~ \kappa є \rho \delta \eta \dot{\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a \cdot ~ \omega ̀ s ~ \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a ̀ \gamma a \theta o i ̀ ~}$






$$
3 \text { ध̇ } \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu \text { Otto } \ell \in \pi i \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \mathbf{A}
$$

3. '̇ $\pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'consideration, thought.' The ms $̇ \pi$ itaoun ('tightening') could scarcely mean 'mental attention.'
4. $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda o \nu$ ] Cf. 28, 4.
5. кат' ย̇ข $ย \rho$.] Cf. єข $\eta \rho \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$, 23, 3 .
6. Od́vatos $\dot{\omega} \rho$.] This probably refers to a law of Tiberius' time, which made it a capital crime to consult diviners about the life of Caesar or future history. The mathematici were constantly being banished from Rome, but were never extirpated. Cf. Tac. Ann. ii 32, xii ${ }^{52}$, Hist. i 22, ii 62. Justin seems here to be guilty of some exaggeration of the facts. Veil suggests that after the Judaean war or the revolt of Barcochba Jewish
prophecies may have been discouraged.
ib. ' $\Upsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \pi o v]$ c. 20.
7. $\Sigma_{\iota} \beta \dot{u} \lambda \lambda \eta$ s] c. 20. The official Sibylline books, deposited in the Capitol, could be consulted only by the quindecinuiri. But the reference here must be to the popular Sibylline prophecies.
8. $\alpha \pi 0 \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \in \psi \omega \sigma \iota \nu . . \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i \nu]$ Tô̂ $\lambda a \beta e i ̂ y$ would be the normal construction.
 in 14,$1 ; 26,8$.
9. عúdpeбтa] i.e. the contents of the books.
10. O.T. prophecy of Christ's session in heaven, future triumph and judgment.
11. катє́ $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ] 'keep' in heaven.





















> I3 каi каiтєן Thirlb om каl A

1．$\delta \iota^{\prime}$ ovis кai кт入．］＇for whose sake He has not consummated His decree＇（of judgment）．See above， 28， 2.

4．$\epsilon โ \pi \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Ps．cix（cx）I -3 ；Matt．xxii 44；Acts ii 34， 35 ； 1 Cor．xv 25 ；Heb．i 13，x 12， 13 ． Compare also Acts iii 21 ．

8．$\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ．$\sigma 0 \hat{v} \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}]$＇The rule belongs to thee，on the day of thy power，in the glory of thy saints； I begat thee before the morning star．＇ The text has a great place in the history of the Arian controversy． The Latin versions have prin－ cipium，and they represent the usual manner of understanding the text； the rendering given above is an attempt to bring out a sense from
the words，but is not necessarily what Justin understood them to mean．

II．$\tau \circ \hat{v}$ रbrov $\tau$ ．$l \sigma \chi$ ．］i．e．the gospel．

12．oi ámb $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda 0 \iota]$ Cf．Mark xvi 20.

16．＇̇v $\tau \in \cup ́ \xi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon]$＇you will read．＇ Cf．44， 13 ．

17．ìs $\pi \rho \circ \notin \notin \phi \mu \in \nu$ ］In c．2，4； II， 2.

46．You may object that those who lived before Christ cannot be considered responsible．But Christ is the Logos and every man has a share of it－those who have lived $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 入byou were Christians，those who lived ävev 入óou were Christ＇s enemies．



 5 रрóvous є́ $\pi i$ Пi


 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu$ ő $\tau \tau a$, ổ $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ خє́vos ả้ $\theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \tau \omega \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon$. 3. каi













## 

1. d入orıor.] 'reasoning absurdly'; not found in classical Greek.
i\%. $\epsilon$ is dं $\pi$ otpon $\eta \nu$ ]' with a view to refuting.'
2. є́катд̀ $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\eta о \nu \tau \alpha] ~ O b v i o u s l y ~}$ a round number.
3. Vortepoy xpoyots] 'somewhat later.' Cf. Lysias 99, 40.
4. є̇ $\pi เ \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu]$ used absolutely, in the sense of 'object', much like ' $\gamma к а \lambda \epsilon i \nu=$ ' to bring in opposition.'
ib. dvevoúvcv] "not accountable.'
5. $\pi \rho о є \mu \eta \nu \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu$ ] in c. 23.
6. ol $\mu \in \tau \dot{a}$ 入byov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] The possibility of 'Christians before Christ' is definitely allowed for by

Justin. See Introd. p. xxii.
11. $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s]$ Cf. c. 5.
ib. 'Hрдклєьтоs] Heraclitus attempted to spiritualize religious ideas, whence probably arises Justin's reverence for him.
12. $̇ \in \nu \quad \beta a p \beta \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho o t s]$ i.e. nonGreeks.
13. 'Avavias к. 'A̧. к. Mıб.] The Three Children of Dan. i 7 and its Apocryphal supplement.

15; тараьтои́ $є \theta a]$ 'we forbear.'
16. áx $\rho \eta \sigma \tau 0 \iota]$ There may be a hint of the same play upon words as in $\mathrm{c}_{0} 4,1.5$.
21. ä̀ $\theta \rho_{0} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa v \eta \theta \eta$ ] Probably $\alpha \nu \theta \rho$. is to be taken as predicate,
$\kappa a i ̀ ~ ' I \eta \sigma o v ̂ s ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \omega \nu о \mu a ́ \sigma \theta \eta$, каi $\sigma \tau а \nu р \omega \theta \epsilon i \varsigma ~ к а i ̀ ~ a ̀ m o \theta a \nu \grave{\omega \nu}$



 $\pi a \rho o \nu \chi \omega \rho \eta{ }^{\sigma} \sigma \mu \in \nu$.







 каì є́татє







I каi $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \theta a \nu \dot{\omega} \nu$ Otto om каi A \| $6 \chi \omega \rho \eta \dot{\gamma} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ Thalem Asht $\chi \omega \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega \mu \in \nu \mathrm{A}$
and the subject of $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa$. is $\dot{\delta}$入óros, in spite of $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \delta u \nu . ~ \tau$. Ab 人ov.
 The reasons so far given for the Incarnation are: to refute the demons (c. 5), to teach the true belief in God (c. 6) and true worship (c. 13), to warn of eternity and judgment (c. 8), to effect a moral regeneration (c. 15), to make atonement for man (c. 32, 7). $\Delta c^{3}$
 $\lambda a \beta \in i ̂ v$.
4. $\tau \circ \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{l} \kappa \tau \lambda$. .] 'the argument concerned with the demonstration of this point,' taking roúrov as genitive
after $\dot{a} \pi o \delta \in l \xi \epsilon \omega s$ (Otto, Maran). Perhaps roút $\omega \nu$ should be read.
47. Prophecies of the fate of Ferusatem.
 10-12.
16. ís $\pi \rho о \varepsilon$ i $\rho \eta \tau 0 \quad \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a i]$ ' as it had been foretold to have happened,' i.e. Justin interprets é $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ as a prophetic past tense (cf. c. 42). The pluperfect $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \tau \%$ is perhaps influenced by $\pi$ тоеi $\rho \eta$ тo.
18. $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} v a$ autcour] 'none of the people.'
19. ท่ $\gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah i 7 ; Jer. ii $\mathbf{1}_{5}, 13$.


 є่тібтаб $\theta \epsilon$.






 $\gamma \in \nu o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ äктшע $\mu a \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \delta \dot{v} \nu a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. 4. $\quad \pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma ~ \tau \epsilon \pi \rho o-$







49. I. Kaì $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \pi \omega ̂ s ~ \delta i ̀ ~ a u ̀ t o ̂ ̀ ~ ‘ H \sigma a l o v ~ \lambda e ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau a \iota ~$



the rebellion of Barcochba, in which Judaea was almost depopulated, the Jews were forbidden by Hadrian to set foot in Jerusalem, under penalty of death.
48. Prophecies of Christ's miracles and death.
6. $\tau \hat{n} \pi a p o v \sigma i a \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah xxxv 5, 6; Matt. xi 5.
7. Tpaví] T Tpavós, $\dot{\eta},-b \nu$ is a later form of $\tau \rho a v\rangle$ 's, $-\epsilon_{s}={ }^{'}$ clear, distinct.'
11. aんкт $\omega$ ] Cf. 35, 9. Justin probably had not seen them, and is merely surmising that they contained details of Christ's history.
14. रôe ктл.] Cf. Isaiah lvii iff.

 $\mu \dot{\epsilon}$ ov is quoted as a prophecy of Christ's resurrection ; and Otto therefore puts here a colon after eipị̀ $\eta$, removing that after aủvoû. This, however, s not necessary. There is no question here of the resurrection, but only of the death; and Justin frequently quotes passages in different ways.
49. Prophecies of Christ's rejection by the Jews and acceplance by the Gentiles.
19. каi $\pi d \dot{\lambda} \iota \nu \quad \pi \hat{\omega} s]$ sc. ג́кои́. батє.




















 каї тò $\pi \iota \kappa \rho o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v ́ . ~$




 $\pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu, \pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu b \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ Sylb om $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ A $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu, \pi a \rho a$ $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ Otto
2. $\epsilon \mu \mu \not \alpha_{\nu}{ }^{2} \mathrm{~s} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah lxv 1-3.
8. 'Iovoaîol ráp] Cf. Acts xiii $27,4^{8}$.
11. $\pi \alpha \rho \in \chi \rho \eta$ бо $\alpha \nu \tau 0]$ ' misused.'
${ }^{15}$. $\left.\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \alpha \tau 0\right]$ 'bade adieu to.'
ib. $\tau \hat{\psi} \dot{\alpha} \gamma$. $\theta \in \hat{\psi}$ à $\nu \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \alpha \nu] \quad \mathrm{Cf}$. c. $I_{4}, 2$.
17. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \dot{v} \sigma \phi \eta \mu \alpha]$ The popular charges against Christians.
21. ov̉ai $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah v 20.
50. Prophecy of Christ's sufferings and तeath for man.
26. ä $\nu \theta^{\prime} \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah lii 12, lii 13 -liii 8.









 $\lambda a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ย̀v















 8 öyourat LXX Otto om A
8. ö $\psi$ ovtal] The insertion of this word from the LXX text is not absolutely necessary, but the homoioteleuton - тal, кal makes the omission explicable. Justin quotes the same passage with $\delta \psi$ ovtat in Tryph. 13, 118.
20. Tacôela eiрض́vךs] The LXX text adds $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which perhaps ought
to be inserted here.
 judgment was lifted up,' perhaps Justin understood it as meaning 'taken away,' or else 'exalted,' i.e., His humiliation was His kingly exaltation (on the Cross). Cf. c. 41, 4 .























1. $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ oûv $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Matt. xxvi 3I; Zech. xiii 7. In Tryph. 53 Justin repeats $\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ đ̀ $\rho$ rò $\sigma r a v$ -
 $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \alpha i$ aủtoû $\delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{a} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ 价 $\chi \rho \iota s$ ö $\tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \in \kappa \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ as a fulfilment of Zechariah. And in Tryph. 106 he says that after the Resurrection the disciples $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \nu \dot{\sigma} \eta \sigma a \nu \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\omega}$
 Harnack traces here the influence of the Gospel of Peter vv. 26, 27, 59 , where the grief and desertion of the Twelve after the Crucifixion are spoken of. The canonical record, however, gives by itself sufficient ground for Justin's statements,
which are roughly true.
2. ขั̈тєpov $\delta \epsilon \in$ ] Cf. Luke xxiv 25, 26, 44-46; Acts i 8, 9 .
3. є่vтvðєîv] 'read,' as previously in many passages.
4. Prophecies of Christ's generation, triumph, ascension, second advent.
5. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah liii 8-I2.
6. Toùs $\pi$ ovinpoús] Referred probably by Justin to the destruction of Jerusalem.
7. $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon]$ sc. aủtov, 'if ye give Him.' The LXX has $\epsilon$ '̇a $\delta \omega \hat{\omega} a \iota=$ 'if He gives Himself.'
 єis Aávatov $\mathfrak{\eta} \psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ av̉тô, каì ध̇v тoîs àvómoıs é $\lambda о \gamma i \sigma \theta \eta$,









 aù兀ov̂ $\sigma \grave{v} \nu$ aủcê.










8. åpatє кт入.] Ps. xxiii (xxiv) 7, 8.
9. $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ dó ${ }^{\prime} \eta s$ ] So in the ' Nicene' Creed. It was not in the Creed adopted at the Council of Nicaea. But the Creed of Caesarea had $\epsilon \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$; and Epiphanius' version of the Nicene Creed has $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\delta 6 \xi \eta s$.
10. 'I $e \rho \in \mu l o v]$ A mistake. The quotation is in the main from Dan. vii 13, but with words from Zech. xiv 5 attached (cf. Matt. xxv 3I). It is rightly ascribed in Tryph. 76.
11. The fulfilment of such prophecies leads us to believe that similar prophecies as to the future, the second coming of Christ, and the punishment of the wicked, shall also be fulfilled.
12. кal à $\gamma \nu 0 o u ́ \mu e v a] ~ O t t o ' s ~ s u g-~$ gestion $\kappa a \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu o o v ́ \mu \in \nu a$ may be right.

2I. $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ о $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \nu \tau a l]$ Note the plural with a neuter plural subject, as in 3 , 1 .
23. $\pi \alpha \theta \eta$ rov̂ $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \dot{\mu} \pi \mathrm{ov}]$ ' $a$ man of suffering.'












 $\pi a v \forall \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$, каì тò $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ aủ $\frac{\hat{\omega} \nu}{\nu}$ ov่ $\sigma \beta \epsilon \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$. 9. каì








4. $̇ \nu \delta \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \ell \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma$ la $\nu]$ I Cor. xv 53. So previously $̇ \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma l a \nu$ in c. 19, 4. With $\dot{\alpha} \xi i \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \delta i \kappa \omega \nu$ must be understood $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$.
ib. ̇̇ $\nu$ ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ai $\omega \nu l q]$ So in c. 20,4 .
5. $\sigma v \nu a \chi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau u \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ezek. xxxvii 7, 8; Isaiah xlv 23; Rom. xiv II. 'A $\rho \mu$ ovia $=$ ' joint.'
6. eis toûto] 'to this purport.' Cf. above 44, 2.
7. o $\sigma \kappa \omega ́ \lambda \eta \xi \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Isaiah lxvi$ 24 ; Mark ix 48. The LXX text of Isaiah has $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota$, the Greek text of Mark has $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \hat{q}$. Justin quotes the passage with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ in Tryph. 44, with $\pi a v u^{\prime} \sigma \tau \alpha l$ in Tryph. I40.
8. каl то́тє кт入.] This somewhat resembles Prov. i 28, but may
not be intended as a quotation at all.
9. Zaxaplou] The following quotation is very composite ; cf. Zech. ii 6 ; Isaiah xliii 5,6 , xi 12 ; Zech. xii $10-12$; Joel ii 13 ; Isaiah lxiii 1 y, lxiv II. The LXX reading of Zech. xii ro is $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \psi$ ov $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \alpha \iota$
 Justin's version may be derived from John xix 37 ö $\psi$ ovtal eis $\delta \nu$ є́ $\xi \in \kappa є \nu \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ (cf. Revel. i 7), or may be the product of oral tradition. The whole quotation looks like a cento of O.T. passages, somewhat like the exhortation in the Commination Service of the English Prayer-book. Justin in Tryph. I4 quotes as from Hosea oै $\psi \epsilon \tau a \iota \delta$
 $\kappa \in ́ \nu \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ 。

 $\sigma \tau о \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \chi \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu, a ̀ \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ котєтòs карঠías, каì ои̉ $\mu \grave{\eta}$




















 25 ’Iov


$$
19 \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{O} \text { Otto } \dot{\partial} \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu \mathrm{A}
$$

53. This fulfilment of prophecy
causes us to believe that Chirist is the
Son of God. And prophecy also has
foretold the belief of the Gentiles and
the unbelief of all but a small rem-
nant of the Jews.
54. áкоvбтккд к. עоєрà $\bar{\omega} \tau a]$ Cf.
Matt. xiii $9,13 \mathrm{ff}$.
do not...only assert without being able to demonstrate.'
55. Éautoùs $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s \delta^{\circ} \rho$. 1 referring to the Gentile Christians. Justin, though born at Flavia Neapolis, cannot have been a Samaritan by descent. It is very remarkable that he should join the Samaritans so closely with the Jews.


 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\pi \grave{o}$ 'Iovסaí $\omega \nu$ каi $\sum a \mu a \rho \epsilon \in \omega \nu$, тà $\pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \epsilon v \theta \in ́ \nu \tau a$
























## ${ }_{17} \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \notin \omega \mathrm{~s}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \dot{\omega} \omega \mathrm{s} \mathrm{A}$

5. єủфpávӨ $\uparrow \tau \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah liv I. Genes. xix.

Cf. Gal. iv 27.
II. $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta о к \eta$ балтєs] Cf. above, 49, 1

It. ís ámò $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega ́ \pi \pi o u$ aủt $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ] as in the person of the Jews.'
i6. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \kappa$ кúptos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah i 9 .

25. 'I $\sigma \rho a \grave{\eta} \lambda \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Jerem. ix 26. The attribution of the passage to Isaiah is a mistake. Justin quotes it also in Tryph. 28, and apparently as from Jeremiah. 'Israel is uncircumcised in heart, but the Gentiles only in the foreskin.'













 $15 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \circ v o \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu ~$








2. 'єфор $\sigma \alpha \iota]$ 'to implant.' Sylb. suggests the more usual word $\epsilon \not \mu \pi \circ \imath \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$.
54. The demons, noticing the prophecies of Christ, tried to forestall them by the heathen myths, but in so doing showed misunderstanding and ignorance of the true meaning of the prophecies.

Here Justin passes to the third topic forecasted in c. 23, viz., that the heathen myths are due to the demons.
10. $\pi \rho о є \beta a \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau о ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda$. $\lambda \in \chi$ 0.] 'put forward many to be salled,
caused many to be called.' Cf. below, тд̀ Пєрбє́a $\lambda є \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \pi \rho о$ є $\beta$ à入оуто.
 ing they would be able to cause men to believe that the statements about Christ were fabulous, like the assertions of poets.'
14. ठัтоv $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa т \lambda] ~ ' w h e r e$. they (the demons) heard the prophets foretelling that Christ would be especially believed in.'
19. $\dot{\text { is }} \pi \rho о є ́ \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu]$ in C. $44,8$.
20. is $\pi \rho о є \mu \eta \nu \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] in c. 32 , I. Genes. xlix 10 , II.


 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aïцать $\sigma \tau a \phi \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} s$. 6. тои́т $\omega \nu$ ov̂v $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$









 тароибías aùtov̂ єïтє ḯттоv ó трокприббómevos, каì viòs 15

## 

3. Tòv $\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda o \nu$ aủroû] In Tryph. $5_{2}$ Justin adds the next clause of the quotation каl $\tau \hat{y}{ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \iota \kappa \iota \tau \partial \nu \pi \hat{\omega} \lambda o \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ övov aưtồ. Here he omits it, perhaps from forgetfulness, and so can continue his argument as if the foal of either horse or ass might equally be intended.
4. otvou] The emendation ôpoy is supported by many commentators. Of course wine was sacred to Dionysus, but so was the ass. Grab. quotes Plin. H. N. xxiv I - Ferulae asinis gratissimo sunt in pabulo, ceteris uero iumentis praesentaneo ueneno; qua de causa id animal Libero Patri assignatur, cui et ferula.' Certainly, if the MS had read 8pov, the corruption to oivop would have been very easy, as Dionysus was the god especially of wine. But in Tryph. 69 the same idea recurs, where the ms text reads oivoo (marg. òvov) èv $\tau 0 i ̂$ is $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho i o t s$ av̉rô̂ $\pi$ тарафє́ $\omega \sigma \sigma \nu$; and, as Veil points out, тарaфє́ $\rho \omega \sigma t \nu$ in that passage would go more naturally
with oivov than with övov. On the whole it may be doubted whether the change to övoo in this passage of the Apology carries conviction. Nothing as yet has been said by Justin on the subject of the foal; that comes later. And Justin is giving instances in which the demons misunderstood the prophecies; to refer firstly to Dionysus' ass and then to Bellerophon's horse would be merely an admission that the demons provided for either contingency, and not a demonstration that they made a complete mistake.
ib. àvayod́фovat] 'ascribe.' On the myth of Dionysus cf. note on p. 35 , line 8 .
5. elte vibs] elte is generally used in the case of alternatives, but not always.
6. $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu]$ accus. in apposition to $\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda o \nu$. The word $\dot{d} \gamma \omega \nu$ seems to be chosen with reference to the representations of Dionysus; it is inappropriate to Christ.










 ＇А $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi \iota o ̀ \nu \pi а \rho \eta \dot{\nu є \gamma к а \nu . ~}$


 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu . \quad$ 2．ö $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ，$\dot{\omega} \varsigma \pi \rho \circ \epsilon i ̂ \pi \epsilon \nu \dot{o}$




## 

I．$\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \in \nu]$ Cf．c． 2 r， 2 ； 32， 10.
ii．Be $\mathrm{B} \lambda \epsilon \rho о \phi$ óvt $\eta \nu$ ］Cf．note on p． 3.5 ，line 11 ．

4．Hoaiou］Cf．Isaiah vii 14， quoted in c．33， 1 ．The passage in Isaiah has no bearing on the As－ cension，lout that had been alluded to in Cc． $45 ; 5 \mathrm{I}, 6$.

5．ठi＇éaltồ］＇by His own power，＇and not on horseback．

6．тòv Пe $\dagger \sigma \in a$ ］＇They caused P＇erseus to be said＇（to have done the same）．See notes on P．35， line 10 ，and $p .37$ ，line 15.
 Cf．1＇s．xviii 6 （xix 5）．

10．$\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \cup \theta \in \nu \tau a]$ neuter plural， according to Otto．But it is much better taken with aúrob．

II．$\theta \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf． 48 ，I．
12．＇А $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi \iota^{\prime} \nu \nu$ c． $2 \mathrm{I}, 2 ; 22,6$.
55．But the demons never anti－ cipated The Crucifuxion，not grasping the symbioiesm of prophetic langrage． －The Cross is the symbiol of Christ＇s pozver，and its form reappears in every circumstance of life．

15．is $\pi \rho 0 \delta \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \tau \alpha \iota$ ］in c． 35. The passage of Isaiah（ix 6）there referred to must be intended in ws


19．ката⿱亠䒑𧰨்батє үáp］This argu－ ment from the symbolism of the Cross is followed by other writers， e．g．Tertullian adu．Marc．iii 18 ； Minucius Ocl．29．Lis value is sentimental rather than logical，and it serves as an answer to the igno－ miny of the Cross，as Maran points
















 lacunam suppletur vi $\xi t$ in marg $B$ secund manu)
out. It is interesting as a literary parallel to the symbolic art of early Christianity.
2. тои̂тo тঠे тро́тalov] 'this token of victory' (the Cross). The allusion is to the yards of a ship. The metaphor of $\tau \rho 6 \pi a z o \nu$ is very frequent in early Christian hymns; from Justin's way of introducing the word it would seem as if the use was already familiar. Cf. Tert. Apol. 16.
4. бкатaveis] 'ditchers.' Bavavбouprol $=$ 'craftsmen.'
6. ' 'p $\gamma \alpha \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu]$ 'tools.'
9. $\mu \nu \xi \omega \tau \hat{\eta} p a]$ ' nose,' rare in singular ; used in plural for 'nostries.'
 20. The LXX text does not read $\pi \rho 6$, and the passage is generally quoted elsewhere without it. .It is possible that Justin's language was
influenced by the memory of Deut. xxviii. 66, a passage which was similarly interpreted. Justin obviously means that as the nose, which is cross-shaped (i.e., at right angles with the brows), is necessary for breath, so the crucified Christ is necessary for the breath of our spirit.
14. $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Otto's emmendation is one among many suggestons for completing the lacuna. It is based on the similar passages in Minucius and Tertullian, lc.
ib. T $\hat{\nu} \nu$ oủ $\xi \xi i \lambda \lambda \omega \nu]$ See Dict. Antiq. on Signa Militaria. The eagle with outspread wings is not unlike a cross.

I5. тротаl $\omega \nu$ ] The tropaeum was a pole with captured weapons hung upon it.
ib. $\delta \iota$ ' ${ }^{\top} \nu$ ] ' under which,' 'to the accompaniment of which.'

 є̇ $\pi \grave{\imath}$ тои́т $\omega$ т $\hat{\varphi}$ б $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \iota ~ a ̉ \nu a \tau i ́ \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon, ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \gamma \rho а \mu \mu a ́-~$ $\tau \omega \nu$ ধ่тороиá̧єтє. 8. каì סıà خóyov oûv каì $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau о$ s
















## 

I. סิєкขvúvтєs] Used by anacoluthon for $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu u ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ agreeing with ข่ $\mu \omega ิ \nu$. Cf. c. 11, 1, $\gamma เ \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \nu \tau \epsilon s$.
2. Tàs eikovas] This may refer to the images of the emperors, which were put, as a sort of medallion, on the eagles of the legions. In this case $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ то́́тч $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau i$ would mean practically 'upon a cruciform standard.' Cavedoni (quoted by Otto) suggests, however, that the reference may be to the pictures of emperors' apotheoses, in which they were represented as being carried to heaven by an eagle or by their genius with outspread wings or arms.
3. Sid $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu d \tau \omega \nu$ ] 'in inscrip. tions.'
4. $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ 入byou кт $\lambda_{\text {.] ] 'we have }}$ tried our best to convince you both by argument and by this obvious symbol.'
5. ő ő $\begin{gathered}\text { ôv.] Cf. c. } 13 .\end{gathered}$
ib. avévevvor] For the idea, cf. c. 3,4 .
56. Even after Christ's coming, the demons tried to deceive mankind by magicians like Simon and Menander.
 sentence is the object of $\epsilon \mu a \theta o \nu$.
13. $\dot{\omega}$ s $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \mu \in \nu$ ] in c. 26.
14. $\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau o]$ Cf. above, c. 26 .
18. Tทे $\nu \in \rho d \nu \quad \sigma \dot{\gamma} \gamma \kappa \lambda \tau \tau \nu \nu$ ] The same phrase as in the dedication, c. 1 .




 $\mu a \theta \grave{o} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ тлáv$\eta \nu$ фuүєîv $\delta v \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$. 4. каì тòv à $\nu$ סрıávтa, єi ßоú $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, каӨаıрŋ́батє.
 $\lambda a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ oi $\phi a \hat{v} \lambda o \iota ~ \delta a i ́ \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma ~ \pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \delta u ́ v a \nu \tau a \iota, ~$







 o้ $\nu \tau \omega \nu$. ف̂v єi $\mu \epsilon ่ \nu$ kópos toùs $\mu \epsilon \tau a \sigma \chi o ́ \nu \tau a s ~ \kappa a ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \iota a u t o v ̂ ~$


I $\theta \epsilon$ òs $\mathrm{A} \theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ Otto $\|$ I $8 \epsilon i \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ Otto $\epsilon i \mu \eta ̀ \mathrm{~A}$

I. $\theta$ cós] $\dot{\omega}$ s $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \nu$. is correct Greek, and the change to $\theta \epsilon \dot{\partial} \nu$ is unjustified.
3. $\sigma v \nu \in \pi \iota \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu o v a s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ ' j u d g e s$. with you of our plea.'
7. $\epsilon i$ ßoú $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Otto cites Theoph. ad Aut. I 14, III 30.
57. We zuish to save you from error and its punishment.) For, in spite of the demons, punishment is a certainty. The demons can cause our death, but that is no hardship. All must die and life soon palls; but our faith saves from suffering and lack. And if death is annihilation, it is a boon to kill us, though they do not mean it so.

This chapter is an appendix to the preceding one, Justin seizing the opportunity to reiterate that his
object is really to save those whom he is addressing from error and the certain punishment of error.
8. $\left.\mu \eta \eta^{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\ell} \sigma \theta a \iota\right]$ A timeless aorist, ' that there is not.'
12. '̇ $\mu \pi \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} s$ ] 'subject to passions.' Opposed to $\alpha \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i$ is below.
ib. $\phi \iota \lambda o \delta o \xi o u ̂ v \tau a s] ~ p e r h a p s ~ i n ~$ the usual sense of 'vainglorious.' But more probably (cf. 12,6 )' deluded,' 'under illusions.'
16. $\tau 0 \hat{} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Cf. с. I I, 2$.
ib. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{\partial}$ à $\lambda \lambda \frac{1}{} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Eccles. i g. On $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ 方 cf. note p. 61, l. 13. 'There is nothing new, but everything is the same in this dispensation of life.'
18. $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \epsilon i \not \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'And since$ satiety befalls after only a year's enjoyment of them.'
$\delta \iota \delta a \gamma \mu a ́ \sigma \iota \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \delta \in \hat{\imath} . \quad$ 3. $\epsilon i \delta^{3} a ̉ \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota \mu \eta \delta \grave{\iota} \nu$








 тòv $\pi \rho о \kappa \eta \rho v \chi \theta$ Є́vтa $\delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu v i o ̀ \nu ~ a v ̉ \tau o \hat{v}$




 $\mu \epsilon ́ v o \iota ~ \beta o \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ a ̉ \theta c ́ \omega \nu ~ \delta o \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \kappa a i ~ \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \gamma i ́ v o \nu \tau a \iota . ~$ 3. oủ $\gamma a ̀ \rho$ ä $\lambda \lambda o ~ \tau \iota ~ a ̉ \gamma \omega \nu i \zeta o \nu \tau a \iota ~ o i ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ \delta a i ́ \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \eta ै ~$




3. $\pi a \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ év $\left.\frac{1}{2} a \hat{v} \theta a \quad \kappa \tau \lambda.\right]$ The same idea is found in Plat., $A p .41$ D.
58. Again, Marcion was inspired by the demons and has caused many to go astray. For the demons wish to lead men away from God and Christ ; instead of raising men from earth they impel them to worship earthly things, whilst those who try to contemplate celestial things they try to drive into impiety.
8. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \neq \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu]$ in c. 26. Marcion maintained that Christ (nonincarnate) was the son of the First God, and that therefore the Demiurge must have another son.
 declares that there is another God besides the Maker of all.'
20. Toùs $\mu \bar{e} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'Those who cannot raise themselves from earth they have pinned and pin to, earthly and manufactured things,' i.e. instead of lifting them up they fix them in degraded servitude. The rendering here given to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
 means 'to raise,' and $\tau \eta \mathrm{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ could be a genit. of separation. But $\epsilon \xi$ al $\rho \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ or (Otto) diral $\rho \in \sigma \theta a l$ would certainly be a more satisfactory word.

入ovoı













 тávта ко́б $\mu о \nu$ ，каì П入át $\omega \nu$ каì oi тaủtà 入éyovtes каì

$8 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s \mathrm{~A}$（et infra）｜｜ 18 raủrà Thirlb Otto $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a \mathrm{~A}$
I．í $\pi \epsilon \kappa \kappa \rho о$ о́оутєs］subtly caus－32，1；44， 8 ．
ing to wander＇or＇tripping up．＇ The word is not elsewhere found； but éккрои́ш is a very common word， and the addition of $\dot{u} \pi \delta^{\prime}$ is easily intelligible．Liddell and Scott men－ tion a use of $\dot{\text { útéккроибıs by Ire－}}$ naeus．

59．Plato and others got their theories of Creation from our teachers．

5．тoû तóyou т．$\delta . \tau, \pi \rho о \phi$ ．］к $\eta$－ $\rho v \chi \theta \in \ell \tau o s$ or some similar word must be supplied．
 c． 10,2 ．This is no definite quo－ tation from Plato，but roughly ex－ presses the sense of various passages in the Timaeus，e．g． $30,53,69$ ．

8．$\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \rho \circ \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \in \in ้ \nu o v]$ Cf．c．

10．rウ̀ $\boldsymbol{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu]$＇originally．＇
12．$\epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Genes．i


16．$\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ ' S o ~ t h a t$. both Plato and his followers and we ourselves have learnt，and you may learn，that the whole world came into being by the word of God out of the existing subject－matter which Moses previously spoke of．＇T $\omega \hat{v}$ ітток．refers to oúpaybs and $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ ，i．e． unformed heaven and earth．Cf． I 64 ，II 5 （6）．Justin seems in this passage to avoid the belief in the eternity of matter．For he regards oujpavós and $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ as the $\dot{u} \pi о к є i \mu \in \nu \alpha$ of the кó $\sigma \mu$ os，and these had been created by God．

тò калоú $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$＂ $\mathrm{E} \rho \in \beta$ os $\pi a \rho a ̀$ тoîs $\pi \sigma \iota \eta \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \epsilon i \rho \eta ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ́-~$ тєроу ímò $\mathrm{M} \omega u ̈ \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega \varsigma ~ o i ́ \delta a \mu \epsilon \nu . ~$










 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \mathrm{~A}$

1．＂Epєßos］Cf．Hes．Theog． 123 ＇Ек Xáєos ס＇＂E $\rho є \beta$ б́s тє $\mu \epsilon ́-$
 may be to the бкбтоs of the above quotation，or perhaps to Deut．xxxii 22，quoted in c． 60 ．It is not impossible，however，that Justin intended to connect the word with the Hebrew＇ereb，＇evening，＇which occurs in Gen．i 5 ，etc．

60．So too Plato has borrowed from Moses（though misunderstand－ ing it）the idea of the Cross and of a Trinity．Thus our doctrines have been the models for others；and the most ignorant among us can teach them，for it is not man＇s wisdom but God＇s power which inspires them．

4．Éx $\nmid \alpha \sigma \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］This is no verbally accurate quotation；but Plat．Tim．36， 13 has raúrทข oûv

 $\tau$ t́pal dà入ŋ́入ats oTov $\chi \hat{\imath} \pi \rho o \sigma \beta a \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu$ катєєкан廿єע $\epsilon l s$ ки́клоу，where the idea is of a cruciform distribution of the anima mundi throughout the universe．Justin＇s citation is typically loose．It means＇God set

Him（His Son）in the form of a $\chi$ in the universe．＇

12．$\pi 0 \iota \eta$ च人al $\tau$ úTov $\sigma \tau \alpha v \rho o u ̂] ~ J u s-~$ tin quotes very loosely and inserts his own commentary．In Numb． xxi 6 ff ．we are not told that Moses made a cross，but a brazen serpent， каi ध̈ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ aủrdv $\epsilon \pi i$ б $\eta \mu \epsilon \mathfrak{l o v . ~ I t ~}$ seems plain that Justin understood $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i o v$ as of a cross．The same idea is found in Barnabas xi $7 \mathrm{M} \omega$－ $\sigma \hat{\eta} s \pi o t \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ тúmov tồ＇Inбoû．Nor are we told that Moses placed the serpent upon the Tabernacle．Again， the quotation $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \eta \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ． is inexact．The LXX version of the passage in Numbers has $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \in \in \cup \in \tau$

 кal E‘jท．In John iii 14 we read
 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ह́p $\eta \mu \psi$ ，oủт $\omega s$ ט́ $\psi \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \delta \nu$

 Justin＇s choice of words may show a knowledge of the text in St John＇s Gospel，but we can hardly infer it with any confidence．In Tryph． 94 he has é $\pi i$ $\sigma \eta \mu \in \hat{i} о \nu$ ยैбт $\eta \sigma \epsilon$ ，




 5．à àvayvoùs П入áтшv каì $\mu \eta$ àкрı $\beta \hat{\omega} s$ èmıбтá $\mu \in \nu о \varsigma, 5$
















 à $\nu$ arvoùs A
and later Ėкท́pu$\sigma \sigma \epsilon$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a \nu$ тoîs


 бтavpoû $\theta a \nu a \tau o v ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu \in ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \alpha)$ ，and again каi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ aủтд̀ $\tau$ тùs $\delta а к \nu о \mu \epsilon \nu$ оus $̇ \kappa \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma \epsilon$ ．

3．Toùs $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ oै．ả $\pi \circ \theta$ ．］This again is an addition to the Bible narra－ tive．

6．$\chi[a \sigma \mu a]$＇two lines placed cross－wise．＇With $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ тò $\nu$ $\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o \nu ~ \theta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu \delta 仑 ́ \nu a \mu \iota \nu$ cf．c． $3^{2}, 10$.

8．кail $\tau \grave{\partial}$ eiा $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇As to his speaking of a third subsistence （this also he borrowed from Moses）
since．＇•Supply $\pi a \rho \grave{a} ~ M \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega s$ $\epsilon \lambda a \beta \epsilon$ ，or the like，from the be－ ginning of the chapter．
ib．Ls $\pi \rho 0 \in i \pi \rho \mu \in \nu$ ］in c． 59,3 ．
13．Tà $\delta$ є̀ трíтa $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \rho i \tau o \nu]$ ＇third place to the third．＇Pseudo－ Plat．Epist．ii 312 E has каi т тiтоע $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho i \tau \alpha$ ．Justin＇s quotation is also found in Proclus Theol．Plat． ii II．The explanation of the meaning of Plato＇s phrase is in－ ordinately difficult．Justin，like other Fathers after him，obviously applies it to the Trinitarian theory．

16．катаß＇̇бєтає кт入．］Deut． xxxii 22.
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тòv $\nu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu$ oै $\nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，каì $\pi \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ каì $\chi \eta ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega ̂ \nu \tau a ̀ s$
















## Io עך

1．$\pi \eta \rho \omega \bar{\nu}]$＇maimed，＇and so perhaps more generally＇infirm．＇ Or he may mean＇blind．＇Cf． Tryph．69，and see Robinson Ep． to the Ephesians（referred to in note above，c．22）．Justin seems to be carrying on the idea of oúde тoùs характท̂pas кт入．，＇who have lost the power of reading if they once had it．＇Being＇maimed＇（ex－ cept in sight）would have no special point．
ib．$\chi$ ท́p由v $\tau$ às oै $\psi \epsilon \iota s]$＇deprived of sight．＇

ib．oủ бофịa кт入．］Cf．I Cor． ii 5 ．

61．An exposition of Christian Baptism．See Introd．p．xxxvii．
4．$\alpha \nu \epsilon \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa а \mu \epsilon \nu$ є．т． $\begin{aligned} \text { ．］Cf．с．}\end{aligned}$ 14， 2.

6．Tovnpev́cty］＇act wrongly．＇ The middle form is occasionally found in classical Greek，but not the active；it may be directly tran－ sitive＇to falsify something．＇

10．עךбтєย́ovtєs ．．．$\sigma v \nu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon v o ́ \nu-$ t $\omega \nu$ ］Cf．Didach． 7 rpò $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ toû


 Bapt． 20.

12．$\epsilon_{\nu} \theta a \quad \forall \delta \omega \rho \epsilon^{6}$ ．］This appears to imply that as a rule baptisms took place out of doors，by river， lake，or sea．Cf．Tert．de Bapt． 4．The Didache l．c．prescribes $v \delta \omega \rho$ కิิ if obtainable．

13．d̀ $\nu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］ 1 Pet．i 3， 23.
 in the threefold Name seems to be the only practice known to Justin， as is the case also in Didach．7． Cf．Matt．xxviii 19，though in the other N．T．references to Baptism the use of the threefold Name is not explicitly referred to．

16．$\pi \nu$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ tou $]$ The absence of the article（here and below）is a little curious．






 Өapoì $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, \dot{a} \phi \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi o \nu \eta \rho i ́ a s ~ a ̀ \pi \grave{o}$ т $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi u \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$








## 

1. à $\nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. John iii 3-5; Matt. xviii 3. (Cod. D in the passage of St John's Gospel reads $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$. Cf. Westcott N.T. Canon P. I54, note 2.) This seems an unquestionable reference to the Fourth Gospel, especially when taken in connexion with the mention of Nicodemus' difficulty. Some commentators compare Ps.-Clem. Hom. xi 26 á $\mu \eta \eta_{\nu} \dot{\cup} \mu i \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu$ $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ Ü $\delta a \tau \iota \quad \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$ els ठิvоца $\pi a \tau \rho \partial ̀ s ~ v i o u ̂ ~ a ́ \gamma i o v ~ \pi \nu є v ́ \mu a \tau o s, ~$
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oủ $\rho a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$, and suggest that both citations come from an apocryphal Gospel. But that seems gratuitous. Variation of text, oral tradition, looseness of quotation can all account for Justin's differences from the Gospel version.
2. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho о \epsilon \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] In c. 44, 3. The quotation is from Isaiah i 16 - 20 .
3. $\lambda$ bơv $\epsilon$ ls toûto $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Referring to the following explanation. Zahn (Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. viii

1886, 66-84) considers toûtov here to be out of place, as not introducing a definite citation. He therefore would excise the word, and see in this sentence (referring back to the exposition of the baptismal ceremonies) a definite acknowledgment of dependence on Didach. 7. The reason for such an emendation is inadequate, though it is quite possible that Justin was acquainted with the Didache.
15. Є̇ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The following sentences give a synopsis of apostolic teaching on the subject, and give what was doubtless the current doctrine of the Church. Some N.T. passages bearing upon the several points are: Eph.v 8; I Pet. i I4 (we are born in ignorance ( $\alpha^{\nu \nu o o u v \tau \epsilon s) ~ a n d ~ b e c o m e ~ b y ~ r e-~}$ generation $\tau \in \in \kappa \nu a \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta s)$ : Rom. vi 4 , viii 2 , ix 8 ; Gal. iv 26 , v I (we are born $\kappa a r^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \eta \nu$ and become тéкעа проаı $\rho$ é $\sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma)$; Acts ii 38 ; xxii 16 (we are born in sin and obtain the remission of sins).












 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ таиิта $\mu a \nu \theta a \nu o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. I3. каі̀ є́т' óvó $\mu a \tau o s ~ \delta є ̀ ~$


入ои́єтаи.
62. I. Kaì tò خoutpòv ס̀̀ tov̂to ảкоv́бaytes oí $\delta a i ́-$


 name (for, as Justin immediately goes on to remark, God is ineffable) but only, for the sake of distinction, the title 'Father.'
ib. тov $\tau \partial \nu \lambda$. árovtos] Is this the sponsor, who attests the faith of the candidate? See the difficult passage in Tert. de Bapt. 6, with Lupton's note. More probably it is the deacon or other person who superintends and administers the laptism, repeating the threefold Name as he does so. Perhaps the phrase $a \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \in \pi i \tau$. $\lambda$. is used rather than $\beta a r \tau i \xi o v \tau o s$ or the like, because, as the word $\lambda o v \sigma b \mu \in \nu o v$ implies, and as many passages in the $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}$. indicate in like manner, the candidate for admission to the

Church dipped himself in the water; it was his own act, to which others might bring him, but which they did not perform for him.
10. övoua ráp] Cf. c. 9, 3; ii 5 (6), I .
II. Єival] sc. b̋voua.
13. $\phi \omega \tau \iota \sigma \bar{\mu} \sigma$ s] Cf. Heb. vi 4, x 32 ; and see Suicer S.v. There is an obvious analogy to the mysteries of the heathen, where such a word was used.
14. $\mu a \nu \theta \alpha \nu b \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ referring to the instruction of catechumens.
62. The demons have anticipated Christian baptism by heathen sprinklings and lustrations; and the taking-off of shoes is borrcwed from Moses' experience.

















 Braun aủroîs Pautigny || 8 M $\omega \dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{A}$ (ita infra $\mathbf{M} \omega \ddot{\omega} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ )

1. $\left.\tau 0 \hat{0} \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \eta^{r} 0 v\right]$ i.e. in Isaiah i 16-20, quoted c. 61, 7.
2. $\dot{\rho} \alpha \nu \tau i \xi \epsilon \iota \nu]$ Sprinklings were common in heathen cultus. Cf. Tert. de Bapt. v, with Lupton's and Oehler's notes. For a complete lustration before mysteries ( $\tau \in \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon_{0 \nu}$ $\lambda о \cup ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ) cf. Paus. xiv 20, 4, who tells us that the women of Tanagra bathed before the orgies of Dionysus.
3. Toे vi $\pi 0 \lambda u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a i]$ For the taking-off of shoes cf. Pythagoras'
 See also Tert. Apol. 40; de Ieiun. 16.
4. кal тoîs aúroîs $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] The Greek of the MS text is strange. Tous is out of place with $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{v}$ ovras, and toîs aúroîs seems harsh. If retained it must be translated 'those who serve them (i.e. the
demons),' though Maran renders it 'iisdem rebus daemones colunt.' Liddell and Scott quote a parallel for the use of $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu$ with dative. If emendation be considered necessary, it might be the most simple course to insert an $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ before $\tau 0 i ̂ s$ aủrois.
5. Tô̂ $\pi . \mu$. $\theta \in$ iov $]$ A mistake. Jethro was Moses' father-in-law. It may be a mere slip of memory, or (Thirlb.) Justin may have confused the story of Moses' vision with that of Jacob's, when he was feeding the flocks of his uncle Laban.
6. $\dot{\pi} \pi b \lambda \nu \sigma \alpha \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Exod. iii 5. Notice the identification of 'the angel of the Lord,' 'the Lord,' 'God,' with Christ.
7. dंкท́коє к.] 'was told to go down.'.




















## $5 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{A}$（ita infr et $\mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s, \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ ）

63．The Yews suppose it was God who spoke to Moses，but it was really Christ．
This is a chapter of digression． Justin is anxious to avoid anthropo－ morphism．The ineffable God needs a medium of communication with men．

4．$\left.\tau \delta \nu a ̀ \nu \omega \nu . \theta_{0}\right]$ Cf．6I，II．
7．$\dot{\omega}$ s $\pi \rho о є \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \mu \in \nu$ ］in c． $37, \mathrm{I}$ ． Cf．Isaiah i 3 ．

12．oúdeis E＇Yע由 $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Matt．xi 27 ；Luke $\times 22$ ；John viii 19 ，xvi 3 ． The quotation appears to come from the Synoptic Gospels，but the com－ ment，with its somewhat curious
 vibs），seems to betray the influence of St John．Irenaeus iv 6 also quotes the words as forming part
of an argument against the Jews． In Tryph．soo the quotation re－ appears with $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$ instead of érvo．As Westcott（N．T．Canon p．137）points out，the variations in the wording of this quotation in our orthodox authorities are striking． Both the use of ${ }^{\varepsilon} \gamma \nu \omega$ and the trans－ position of clauses can be paral－ leled from writers who admitted the four Canonical Gospels exclu－ sively，e．g．Irenaeus，Origen，Epi－ phanius．

14．ís $\pi \rho 0$ 臽 $\phi \mu \in \nu$ ］in C． $2 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}$ ； 22, I， $2 ; 23,2 ; 32$ ， 10.

15．$\alpha \pi$ б́oтo入os］Cf．c．12， 9 ； Heb．iii 1.

17．ठ̀ є́цой גккои́шу ктл．］Cf． Matt．x 40；Luke x 16 ；John xiv 24.
7. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau a \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ a v ̉ \tau o i ̂ s ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega \varsigma . ~ K a i ~ \epsilon ่ \lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon ~ M \omega u ̈ \sigma \epsilon i ̂ ~$

 $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ \sigma o v . ~ 8 . ~ к а ́ т є \lambda \theta \epsilon ~ \epsilon i \varsigma ~ A i ̌ \gamma v т т т о \nu ~ к а i ~$

 à $\nu a \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \iota ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a . ~ I O . ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda ’ \epsilon i s ~ a ̉ \pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \iota \nu ~ \gamma є \gamma o ́ v a \sigma \iota \nu ~$










 12. ő $\theta \in \nu$ каі тò трофŋтькòv $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ є̀ $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \chi o \nu ~ a v ̉ \tau o v ̀ s ~$
 13. каì $\pi a \dot{\lambda} \iota \nu$ ó 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ \varsigma, ~ \grave{\omega} \varsigma ~ \epsilon ́ \delta \eta \lambda \omega ́ \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi a \rho ' a v ̉ \tau o i ̂ \varsigma ~ \omega ̂ \nu ~$ $\epsilon i \pi t \epsilon \nu$. Oủ $\delta \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \epsilon ้ \gamma \nu \omega ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \epsilon i ́ ~ \mu \eta े ~ o ́ ~ v i o ́ s, ~ o v ̉ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ v i o ̀ \nu ~$





 15. oi $\gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ v i o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \phi a ́ \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \epsilon i \nu a \iota ~ \epsilon ̂ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \chi o \nu \tau a \iota ~$

1. кai $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\lambda} \eta \sigma \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Exod. iii 2, 6, 10, 14, 15. Justin's argument, though he does not make it quite explicit, turns on the fact that the same speaker who says 'I am the God of Abraham' is
described also as 'the angel of the Lord.' Cf. Hil. de Trin. iv 32.
2. $\grave{\epsilon} \xi$ द̇ $\kappa \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu]$ i.e. from Moses' writings.
 an angel.
$\mu \eta ं \tau \epsilon \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota, \mu \eta \theta^{\prime}$ öть $\epsilon \sigma \tau \grave{\nu} \nu v i o ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \pi \tau \rho \grave{\imath}$




















2 ôs $\lambda$ doros кai Otto ôs кai $\lambda$ bros $\mathrm{A} \| 20 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma^{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ A (ita infra M $\omega \ddot{u} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ )
2. Ós $\lambda$ त́pos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. John i 1 ; Phil. ii 6.
4. єiкbuos àб $\sigma \mu a ́ \tau o u]$ 'imagre of an incorporcal bcing,' or else 'incorporeal form.'
6. ís $\pi \rho \rho \in i \pi o \mu \in \nu]$ in C. $32,14$.
13. $\mu \dot{e} \nu \in(\nu)$ Cf. Matt. xxii 32.
15. $\dot{\eta} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu]$ 'busied themselves.'
64. The demons anticipated the doctrine of the Spirit in the myth of Koré, and of creation in the myth of Athena.
17. id d̀ àvelpetv кт入.] 'to raise an image of Kore over the springs of water.' It is not easy, in our
present state of knowledge, to see the resemblance between the position of Koré and that which is ascribed to the Spirit. In Diod. Sic. v 4 we read $\tau \grave{\eta} \mathrm{K} b p \eta \nu \lambda a \chi$ єî


 $\nu \eta \nu$. Moreover in the record concerning the mysteries of Andania she is called ' $A \gamma \nu$ ' ' and a stream is named after her. (Cf. Farnell Greek Culls iii, Demeter-Kore; 246.) There seems to be no other evidence to suggest a connexion between Kore and springs.

ขоŋ̂бaı $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．










 $\mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ．6．каì ó óoíms toùs ä̀ $\lambda \lambda$ ovs $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu e ́ v o u s ~ v i o u ̀ s ~$ тov̂ $\Delta i o ̀ s ~ a i ~ \pi \rho a ́ \xi є \iota \varsigma ~ e ̀ \lambda e ́ \gamma \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu . ~$








## 

1．Ĺs $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\psi} \psi a \mu \in \nu]$ in c．59， 2.
7．$\pi о \nu \eta \rho \in \cup \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu 01]$＇behaving with trickery，＇Cf． 6 I ，I．

8．$\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \grave{\eta} \epsilon ้ \nu \nu . \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇Since they$ knew that God conceived and made the world by the Logos（or by Reason）．？

9．$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \nu$ 光 $\nu \nu o t a \nu]$ Cf．c． 26,3 ．The reference here is to the myth of Athena springing full－ grown from the brain of Zeus．

10．$\gamma \in \lambda o t o \tau a \tau o \nu]$ The absurdity consists in imagining an incor－ poreal thing in bodily form．Otto quotes Prudent．c．Symm．ii 58.

13．ai $\pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\epsilon \epsilon s] ~ ' t h e i r ~ a c t i o n s . ' ~}^{\text {．}}$
65．An account of the Christian Eucharist following Baptism．Cf．

Pliny Ep．x 96 ；Didach．9， 10. This account resembles that in c． 67 ；but the early part of the service as given in c． 67 is here left out，because Justin is describing only the admission of a convert． Justin＇s account is very simple and naive，perhaps purposely，on ac－ count of his heathen readers．

14．oűrcs］as described in c．6r．
15．бvүкататє $\theta \epsilon \iota \mu$ ย́vov］＇who has assented．＇
ib．ádè $\phi$ oús $]$ Cf．Matt．xxiii 8. See Tert．Apol． 39.

19．$亠 \bar{\alpha} . \pi$ по入ıтєutal］＇good livers．＇ The word is not，so far as I know， found elsewhere in this sense．But cf．$\pi 0 \lambda$ lтelav，4， 20.












 тароиิбıv áтоф́́pov $\iota$.







1. фı $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \iota]$ Cf. Tert. de Orat. 14; Cyr. Jer. Catech. Myst. v 3.
2. $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \iota \iota$ Cf. I Tim. v 17 . The word is pagan and not only Christian. The fact that the $\pi \rho \circ \in \sigma \tau \omega$ 's was not present at the actual loaptism, and only received the neophyte afterwards, is in accordance with the apostolic practice. Acts xix 5, 6 (cf. I Cor. i 14), and $\times 48$.
3. каi крд́натоs] краิ $\mu=$ 'mixed wine and vater.' On the reading sec Introd. p. xliii. Could крâua mean 'wine to mix it with' or ' wine mixed with it'?
4. тои́т $\omega \nu$ ] i.e. 'these gifts.'
5. $\epsilon \pi i \pi m o \lambda u ́]$ 'at length.
6. '̇ $\pi \epsilon v \emptyset \eta \mu \epsilon i$ ] 'assents.' So in Homer, 1l. i 22.
ib. 'A $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu]$ Taken from the synagogue worship. Cf. i Cor. xiv 16.
7. oi $\delta \iota a ́ c o v o l] ~ I t ~ w a s ~ a p p a r e n t l y ~$ not a priestly duty to distribute the sacrament.
8. $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \eta \theta$ évtos] 'dedicated with thanks.' The transitive use recurs in 67,4 . Cf, also Iren. I

9. Explanation of the term Eucharist and of the belief associated with the elements.
10. $\dot{\eta} s$ oú $\delta \epsilon \nu \dot{\nu} \notin \lambda \lambda \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The qualifications for admission to the Eucharist are (1) faith, (2) baptism, (3) obedience. Cf, Didach. 9-
11. ف̀s кoเvdेv ä.] Cf. Iren. Iv xviii 5 (a passage plainly recalling Justin) oủкérı косขòs d́pros Ė $\sigma \tau(\nu$, $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{u} \chi a \rho t \sigma \tau i a$.







 aùtoîs＇тòv＇I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ \nu ~ \lambda a ß o ́ v \tau a ~ a ̆ \rho \tau o v ~ є u ̉ \chi a \rho i \sigma \tau \eta ' \sigma a \nu \tau a ~ \epsilon i-~$


 aùtoîs $\mu \in \tau a \delta o u ̂ v a l . ~ 4 . ~ o ̋ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ к а i ̀ ~ \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ т o ̂ ̂ ~ M i ̂ \theta \rho a ~$ $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ o \iota s ~ \pi а \rho є ́ \delta \omega \kappa а \nu ~ \gamma i \nu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu \iota \mu \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota ~ o i ~ \pi о \nu \eta \rho o i ~$



1．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \nu \tau \rho \dot{\delta} \pi \sigma \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］On this passage see Introd．p．xli．
$i$ b．Sıà $\lambda$ byov $\theta \epsilon o \hat{u}]$ Cf．c． 46,5 ．
3．$\delta_{i}^{\prime}$ єix $\chi \hat{s} s$ तóoul A com－
 eúxapiotias makes it seem impro－ bable that $\lambda$ óoou should depend upon eỉ $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$（＇prayer to the Word＇） instead of $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \hat{\eta} s$ depending upon入órov．Otto well says＇nempe $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ ，入óyou $\theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$ et $\delta i^{\prime}$ єủ $\chi \hat{\eta} s$ गóyou toù $\pi a \rho$＇ aủroû（scil．रpıбтoû）sibi inuicem respondent，ita quidem，ut pre－ cationis uerbo a Christo profecto Iustinus diuinam uim tribuat，qualis in dei $\lambda$ ó $\gamma \omega$ insit．＇

8．$\dot{a}$ ка入єìtaı єủarү．］There is not the least reason for thinking that these words are a gloss，for the heathen would not have in－ serted them，and the Christians would not have required them，as they had no gospel that competed with the four of the Canon．Cf．


and 100 （where also the word a $\pi 0$－ $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ деє́йата for the gospels recurs）
 The plural form shows that Justin knew of at least two＇Gospels＇； the singular may denote some kind of＇harmony＇of them．
9．$\tau \partial \nu$＇I $\eta \sigma$ oûv $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Luke xxii 19 ff．；Mark xiv 22 ；Matt．xxvi 26；1 Cor．xi 23 ．
12．$\mu$ obocs］The words prepare for the reference to＇mysteries＇in the next sentence；and，like the clause $\hat{\eta}$ s oú $\delta \omega \nu$ äd $\lambda \lambda \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．above， they tacitly meet the objection that the Christian worship was for bad reasons concealed from observa－ tion．

13．Miepa］Cf．Cumont Culte de Mithras p．${ }^{176 .}$ Tert．de Praescr．Haer． 40 says of the Mithras－communicant＇celebrat et panis oblationem．＇Justin speaks again of the mysteries of Mithras in Tryph． 70.
 $\tau a i ̂ \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̂ \mu v o v \mu e ́ v o v ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau a i ̂ s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega ̂ \nu, \hat{\eta} \epsilon \in \pi i ́-$ $\sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon \hat{\eta} \mu a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ סv́vaб $\theta \epsilon$.
67. I. 'H $\mu \in i ̂ ̧$ סè $\mu \in \tau a ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ \lambda o ル \pi o ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \epsilon \grave{~} \tau о u ́ \tau \omega \nu$

 2. $\epsilon \pi \pi \grave{\imath} \pi a ̂ \sigma i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ o i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a ~ \epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda o \gamma o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau o ̀ \nu \pi o \iota \eta \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$









2. $\mu \epsilon \tau$ ' Є̇ $\pi i \lambda b \gamma \omega \nu \quad \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' with some words said over them.'
67. An account of the Sunday. Eucharist.
5. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda^{2}$ ous $\alpha \nu a \mu$.] Cf. Heb. $x$ 24 f .
ib. of é $\chi$ ovics] as in I Cor. xi 22.
6. $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \mu \in \nu]$ Cf. Tert. Ap. 39.
7. $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ 'we receive.' Cf. I3, I, and for the custom see ${ }_{1}$ Tim. iv 3 f.
9. $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau$. $\dot{\eta} \lambda$ lou $\lambda . \dot{\eta}_{\text {. }}$ The usual Christian term is $\dot{\eta}$ кирьакウ̀ $\dot{\eta} \mu$ épa. On the heathen week and days of the week see Dict. of Chr. Antiq. s.v. 'Week.' Cf. also Tert. Ap. 16, ad Nat. i 13. Clem. Al. Strom. vii 12 (p. 877 , Potter) refers to the days of Hermes (Wednesday) and Aphrodite (Friday).
ro. arpoús] An indication of the spread of Christianity. Cf. Pliny Ep. x 96 'neque ciuitates tantum sed uicos etiam atque agros contagio peruagata est.'
11. бvvè $\lambda \epsilon v \sigma t s]$ Cf. Acta $S$.

Fustini 3 .
 in Christian literature of a liturgical reading of the Gospels. For the public reading of other Christian writings at this period see Dionysius of Corinth ap. Eus. H. E. iv 23.

I3. $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi p \iota s \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \chi$.] 'as long as there is time for.' Cf. Tryph. 118 wis érx$\omega \rho \in \hat{\varepsilon}$.
ib. тov d.var.] So the $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon-$ $\sigma \tau$ ús did not read.
14. סıà $\lambda$ boou] 'in a speech.'
16. àvıoтá $\mu \in \theta a$ ] The usual attitude for prayer. Apparently they sat to hear the reading. Were these prayers silent prayers, or private extempore prayers uttered aloud, or fixed prayers that all knew and could join in with their voices? It is perhaps impossible to decide; but from Clem. Rom. ad Corinth. 59-6I, Didach. 9, 10 we see that liturgical prayers may have been in use in the Christian Church by now.
 $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau а \iota ~ к а і ~ o i ้ \nu о s ~ к а i ̀ ~ v ̌ \delta \omega \rho, ~ к а i ~ o ̀ ~ \pi \rho о є \sigma \tau \omega ̀ s ~ \epsilon v ̉ \chi a ̀ s ~$





 $\tau \hat{\iota} \pi \rho \circ є \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \iota$ à $\pi о \tau i \theta \epsilon \tau a \iota, \quad$ 7. каì aủтòs є่ $\pi \iota \kappa о \cup \rho є \hat{\imath}$












1. $\dot{\omega} \pi \rho_{0}{ }^{\prime} \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ] in 65,3 .
2. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \in \rho \in \tau \alpha l]$ i.e. to the president. Cf. 65,3 . It does not refer to an oblation of the elements.
3. öซ $\eta$ סúv.] Cf. 13, I ; 55, 8; Tryph. 80, and the Eucharistic formula in Const. Apost. viii 12

 $\mu \in \theta a$. See also Didach. io toîs
 ö $\sigma a$ ө่́ $\ 0 v \sigma \iota \nu$.
4. катд $\pi \rho \circ \alpha i \rho \in \sigma \iota \nu]$ Cf. 14,2 ; Tert. Ap. 39 'nemo compellitur sed sponte confert.'
5. кท $\delta \epsilon \mu \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}]$ 'curator' (Otto). Hatch Organiz. p. 39 f. makes great use of this passage to support his theory of the origin of the
episcopate.
 xvi 2. There is no reference to the fourth commandment.
6. $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ кроעєкทิs] Friday was caled dies Veneris. Some have supposed, perhaps over-fancifully, that this paraphrase is here adopted in order to avoid using the name of Venus.
7. фaveis $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Probably no special discourse is alluded to. The passage need not be understood to mean that Justin knew of no appearance after the first day, though this might be imagined from St Luke's Gospel, if it stood alone, The words $\tau \hat{\eta} \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau_{0} \kappa \rho$. are perhaps to be attached only to $\phi a$ $\nu \in i$ s.

68．I．Kaì єi $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ú $\mu i ̂ \nu ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma о v ~ к а i ~ a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i a s ~$










 $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \omega ́ \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu \kappa a i$ є่ $\xi \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \iota \nu \pi \epsilon \pi о \iota \eta \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．4．iт $\pi \epsilon \tau a ́-$

 єै＇тт тò ả $\nu \tau i ́ \gamma \rho a \phi o \nu ~ т о и ̂ т о . ~$


## Hadrianus Minucio Fundano．

6．є่ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \eta ̀ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \xi a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ accepi litteras ad me $20 \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a ́ \nu \mu o \iota ~ a ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \sum \epsilon \rho \eta \nu i ́ o v ~ s c r i p t a s ~ a ~ d e c e s s o r e ~ t u o ~$




 इepetvitou Eus $H E$ Iv 9

68．If you think our story true， respect it；if not，treat it as non－ sense，but do not put to death those who do no ill；for you will be punished by God，if you persist in injustice．There follows Hadrian＇s rescript to Fundanus．

2．E $\chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota]$ used as in Heb．vi 9.
5．т $\grave{\nu} \nu \kappa \rho[\sigma \iota \nu]$ Cf．Wisd．vi 3 f．
7． 8 фìov кт入．］Cf．Plat．Crit． 43 D el taúrn roîs $\theta$ eoîs $\phi i \lambda \frac{\nu}{\text { ，}}$ тaút $\eta$ é $\sigma \tau \omega$（the reading of marg．A
is nearer to the Platonic form）．Kal $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon$ is seems to imply that the say－ ing had become proverbial．Variant forms of it appear in Plat．Ap． 19 A，Phaedr． 246 D；Epict．Einchir． 50 （79）．

9．тoû ratpòs v．］See Introd． p．xlvii．

12．$\tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \omega \dot{\nu}$. ］as in C． I ．
17．Мıроикiч $\Phi$ ．」Eus．／1．E．iv 8 says that Justin aúrウ̀v $\pi a p a r \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \tau a \iota$


Гралıа⿱亠乂，$\lambda a \mu \pi$ рота́тоv ảv－ סрós，övtıva $\sigma v ̀ ~ \delta \iota \epsilon \delta \epsilon ́ \xi \omega$. 7．ov̉ ठокєî ov̉v $\mu$ น८ тò $\pi \rho \hat{a \gamma \mu a ~ a ̀ \zeta \eta ́ \tau \eta т о \nu ~ к а т а \lambda \iota-~}$ $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ，ǐva $\mu \eta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon$ oi ă $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi о \iota$ тара́ттшутаı каі̀ тоі̂ऽ бขко－ фа́ntaıs ðорŋуía какоир－才ías $\pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \in \theta \hat{\eta}$ ．8．aै้ oűv $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s$ єis тaútŋv тウ̀ $\nu$
 $\nu \omega \nu \tau a \iota \delta \iota i \sigma \sigma \chi \nu i \zeta \xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa a \tau 亠 幺$
 ßグィатоя а́токрірєбӨає，є̇ті


 $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu, \epsilon \not ้ \quad \tau \iota \varsigma$ катŋүорєі̂ల ßоv́八оוто，тоиิто́ $\sigma \epsilon \delta \iota a \gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．10．єї тıৎ oûv катךүорєî каі סеíк－

Serennio Graniano，clarissi－ mo uiro，et non placet mihi relationem silentio prae－ terire，ne et innoxii per－ turbentur et calumniatori－ 5 bus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio．itaque si euidenter prouinciales huic petitioni suae adesse ualent aduer－ sum Christianos，ut pro 10 tribunali eos in aliquo argu－ ant，hoc eis exequi non prohibeo．precibus autem in hoc solis et adclamatio－ nibus uti eis non permitto． 15 etenim multo aequius est， si quis uolet accusare，te cognoscere de obiectis．si quis igitur accusat et pro－ bat aduersum leges quic－ 20
 крivéəal A àтокрірабөaı Eus
 т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \in \tau \in і \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \in \nu$ ，The MSS of Justin have it in Greek ；but what appears to be the Latin original is preserved in Rufinus＇translation of Euseb．Eccl．Hist．and is inserted above，as it stands in Mommsen＇s text．On the authenticity of the rescript and the position implied by it see Appendix II．It is to be noted that in some places the Latin seems to be stronger than the Greek，e．g，oi $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ oı repre－ sents＇innoxii，＇סtopı̧ॄ＇supplicia
 suppliciis seuerioribus uindices＇； mistranslation may account for this．

C．Minucius Fundanus was consul

A．D．10\％，proconsul of Asia pro－ bably about A．D．125．Q．Licinius Silvanus Granianus was consul A．D． rob，proconsul of Asia about A．D． 123，124．The mistake Serenius for Silvanus is at least as old as Eusebius， and may be due to a scribe．

3．Tठ $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a]$ i．e．＇the matter reforred to $m e^{\prime}$（relationem）．

7．Хорŋүіа как．］＇facility for wrongdoing．＇

10．oi ė $\pi a \rho \chi$ ．］＇the provincials．＇
15．$\mu$ ．Boaîs］Cf．Tert．Apol． $4^{\circ}$ ＇statim Christianos ad leonem accla－ matur．＇

18．то̂̂тठ $\sigma \epsilon \delta \iota a \gamma$ ．］＇you must judge＇（and not be led away by mere clamour）．
$\nu v \sigma i ́ ~ \tau \iota ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \nu o ́ \mu o v s ~$


 $5 \kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ a, \epsilon^{\prime \prime}$ тıs бvкофа⿱亠тias $\chi$ á $\rho ı \nu_{,}$тоиิто $\pi \rho о т$ évol，ס८a－

 ầ $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota a s$ ．
quam agere memoratos homines，pro merito pec－ catorum etiam supplicia statues．illud mehercule magnopere curabis，ut si quis calumniae gratia quemquam horum postu－ lauerit reum，in hunc pro sui nequitia suppliciis se－ uerioribus uindices．

1．1．Kaì тà $\chi$ Ө̀̀s $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \pi \rho \omega \eta \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$





1．$\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$ rovis $\nu \delta \mu o v s]$ The lan－ guage is quite vague．Christianity was already illegal，and is not hereby legalised．See below．

6．סцa入́apave $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇arrest him$ for his villainy＇．For this use of
 615 E ．

The four points in this edict， according to Ramsay（Ch．in Rom． Emp．p．322），are（1）the desire to prevent public trouble and to check the licence of false accusers；（2）the provincials may prosecute，but must bring evidence；（3）there must be proof of illegality；（4）the prose－ cutor who fails must be punished． The vagueness of the third point is probably deliberate ；it is practically left open to any governor to con－ sider the mere name of Christian an offence，if proved（as Trajan＇s letter had admitted），or to require proof of some more definite crime， according to his own bias in the matter．

1． 1 must for your own sake write this account．What happened under Urbicus is only a specimen of what
is done to us everywhere．Sinners， whom Christian friends have re－ proved，and the demons，who use judge and magistrate as their tools， are combined to procure our death．

On the connexion between this and the preceding A pology cf．Introd． p．xliv．

II．$\chi \theta$＇̀s $\delta \epsilon$ ］It has been argued from this $\delta \epsilon$ that these words could not have formed the beginning of an independent treatise．But Otto points out that Xenophon begins his Oeconomicus and his Apologia Socratis（he might have added his Conuiuium）in a similar manner．

12．Oúp $\beta$ ikou］Q．Lollius Urbicus， a man of distinction；he had been consul，legatus in Germany and Britain，and was praefectus Urbi from A．D． 144 （at the earliest）till 160.
ib．$\hat{\omega}$＇P $\mathrm{\omega} \mu \mathrm{a} i o t]$ This may be，as Veil suggests，an interpolation，in－ serted after the separation of this part from the first．But it is not impossible to regard it as a mere rhetorical expression．







 $\tau \hat{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$ ( $\lambda \in ́ \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu)$, $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~$




I $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{~A} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ Otto || $3 \sigma \dot{v} \nu \tau a \xi ̆ \iota \nu$ edd $\sigma \dot{v} \nu a \xi \iota \nu \mathrm{~A} \| 8 \sigma \nu \gamma \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \mathrm{~A}$ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta \in \sigma \in \sigma \neq \alpha$ Otto Krüger

1. $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ This is in accordance with Justin's usual idea. Cf. i 3, 4. Otto's emendation is an obvious suggestion, and may be correct.
ib. кâע d̀vô̂tc] '(You are our brothers), even if you are ignorant of the fact and repudiate it on account of the splendour of their position' (i.e. of the $\dot{\eta} \gamma o v ́ \mu \in \nu=u$ above).
2. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \in \tau$. $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ бט́vт.] Veil suggests that this phrase indicates the two Apologies to be a collection of various $\lambda$ obot, and attempts to break them up into three fairly equal parts, supposing the two Apologies (treated as one) to have been written on three rolls. These suppositions are not impossible, but the phrase here is too vague to justify such definiteness; it means either 'the composition of these arguments, of this address,' or, referring only to what follows, 'the composition of this story.' Aóroc is a mere collective plural, and does not imply that the Apologies are a compilation of definitely separable
$\lambda$ írot.
3. ôs à $\nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] A very clumsy. sentence. There is a double subject to the verb тaparкevásovatv,
 $\phi a \hat{0} \lambda o t$ daluoves. The enemies of Christianity are therefore ( I ) any who have been reproved for their sins ( ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \psi / s=$ delictum $)$, 一that is, everyone except such as are Christians ;-their hostility is caused by their obstinacy and love of pleasure and unreadiness to embrace what is good; (2) the demons, who can control the judges. It should be observed, however, that the ms has left a space before кai oi $\phi$. $\delta$., as if some words had been lost.
4. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \dot{\ell} \sigma \theta a i]$ The change to $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ marks the parallelism with ко入aб $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a l$, but is not necessary.
5. toùs tooútous] i.e. such as Urbicus. 'The judges are their servants and slaves, just as the rulers (or magistrates) are their tools,' i.e. both judicial and administrative officials are under the demons' power.


 $\mu$ éva ả $\pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$.
 $\lambda a \sigma \tau a i ́ \nu o v \sigma a$ каì av̉тウ̀ $\pi \rho o ́ т \epsilon \rho o \nu . ~ 2 . ~ \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \tau о \hat{v}$




















6. Story of a Christian martyrdom.
7. 入órou ópoû] a Platonic phrase $=$ 'right reason.' Cf. ii $6(7)$, 7; 9, 4.
8. Tópous $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \hat{\eta} s$ ] 'means of pleasure?
9. € $\xi \in \delta v \sigma \omega \pi \epsilon i \tau 0]$ 'she was intreated carmesily.' Joseph. Ant. XV iv I .
10. T̂ิv au่тท̂s] 'her Christian friends.'
11. 'A $\lambda \epsilon \xi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu]$ Alexandria was a notoriously licentious city.
12. $\rho \in \pi о и ́ \delta \iota o v] ~ L a t . ~ r e p u d i u m . ~$ Ashton points out that Roman law allowed women to divorce their husbands, whilst Mosaic law only allowed men to divorce their wives. Cf. 1 Cor. vii 13 foll.



 $\mu \eta ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda o \mu e ́ v o v ~ a ̉ \pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \eta s ~ к а т \eta \gamma o p i ́ a \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \pi о i ́ \eta \tau a \ell, ~ \lambda \epsilon ́-5$






 бато], $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa а \lambda о \nu ~ є ่ к є і ̀ \nu \eta ร ~ \tau \hat{\omega \nu} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \mu a \forall \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$



 II. каì тòv Птодє $\mu a i ̂ o \nu, \phi \iota \lambda a \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta$ à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủk ảтaт $\eta \lambda o ̀ \nu$ oủסè $\Psi \in \cup \delta o \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu \eta \nu ~ o ै \nu \tau а, ~ o ́ \mu о \lambda o \gamma \eta ́ \sigma a \nu \tau a ~ є ́ a v \tau o ̀ \nu ~$





 separation after $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda a \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$, agreeing with aúroû understood. 'When she had separated from him since he refused to alter his ways.'
13. $\beta \iota \beta \backslash[\delta เ o \nu]$ Lat. libellus.
14. бol $\tau \hat{\psi}$ aúтокрáторє] There is apparently only one aúтoкра́т $\omega \rho$ concerned. See Introd. p. li.
15. $\delta \nu \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{p}} \beta$. єкко ${ }^{2}$.] These words certainly look like a gloss, though they were probably already inserted in Justin's text by the time of Eusebius.
 tion how 'centurions' came to do such duty, see Le Blant Les Persécuteurs et les Martyrs ch. xxv, esp. p. 300 f .
16. $\epsilon$ is $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \grave{\alpha} \quad \epsilon \mu \beta$. $\tau$. Пाтo入.] These words may be retained, the sense being 'to imprison Ptolemy and, arresting him, to ask.' But they read like a gloss to explain $\lambda a \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a l$. They are found in Eusebius' version.
17. aủтঠे тои̂тo $\mu$ bvov] Cf. i 4. Eusebius' text may quite well stand.






 $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \hat{\varphi} . \quad$ 15．каì той Oủpßíкоv кєлєú－









 бѝ єîvaı тo九ỗтos．18．каì тô̂ पouкíov фク́баутоs．



II aitía；toû Braun Otto aitía tô̂ Eus｜｜ 14 óvópatos $\delta \hat{\text { è }} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu o \hat{v}$ Eus


 тò̀ $\theta \epsilon \partial \partial \nu \pi о \rho$ ．Eus

2．$\tau \grave{d} \kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ €́avт $\hat{\varphi} \quad \sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi เ \sigma \tau$ ．］ ＇conscious of the good which he owed to the teaching which proceeded from Christ，he confessed the doctrine of divine virtue．＇
 he who denies anything either denies it because he has condemmed it，or shrinks from confessing il，because he knows himself to be unworthy of and alien to it．＇

7．$\dot{\omega} \nu \operatorname{ou} \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Plin．Ep．x
$96^{6}$ quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt re uera Christiani．＇

9．$\alpha \pi a \chi \theta \hat{\eta} v a l]$ Lat．duci，as in Pliny l．c．Cf．Acts xii 19.

11．$\tau i s \dot{\eta}$ altia；rov̂］Toû stands for tivos $\left(x^{\text {appiv }}\right)$ ．Cf．Tiyph．20， то仑ि $\mu$ クे акои́бєб $\theta \epsilon$ ；

15．$\varepsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] The omission$ of Verus＇name seems strange．See Introd．p．li．


 трітоя єं $\pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ кода⿱

## 

$3 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ Eus $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \mathrm{~A}$

3．к．$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta]$＇was also sentenced to be punished．＇

3 （4）．You may ask＇why do you not all commit suicide and so go at once to heaven？The answer is that lo commit suicide is to shirk our duty to man and is therefore con－ trary to God＇s will；and we do not deny our Christianity，when accused， because to do so would be untrue， and because we wish to free you from your prejudices against Christianity．

In the text the order of chapters as it stands in the MSS has been preserved．In most editions（e．g． Maran，Otto，Braun，Krïger）c．viii has been taken out of its place and put after c．ii，and this chapter appears therefore as c．iv．The reasons for this transposition are twofold；（I）Euseb．H．E．iv I7， after quoting the second chapter of this Apology，adds toútols ó＇Iovativos єiкót $\omega$ к каi áко入oú $\theta \omega s$ âs $\pi \rho о є \mu \nu \eta$－ $\mu о \nu \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \mu \in \nu$（in H．E．iv i6）aủzô̂ $\phi \omega \nu a ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ K a ̉ \gamma \dot{~}$ oûv $\pi \rho o \sigma$－

 Eusebius is so inaccurate in his quotations that such words can scarcely entitle us to neglect the MS order；nor need dко入oú $\theta \omega$ ， mean＇immediately following；＇ though certainly that is the more natural meaning to assign to it． （2）It is said that the transposition gives a better consecutiveness of ideas，that c．viii interferes with the sequence of cc．vii and ix．This argument，even if true，is hardly convincing in the case of a thinker so inconsecutive as Justin．But it may even be doubted whether the argument is true．（a）Chapter iii certainly seems to follow c．ii very
naturally；the heathen opponent wishes the Christians would all do like the $\tau \rho i \tau o s$ just mentioned，and $\pi$ opév－ $\epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ in c．iv § I picks up the idea in торєи́єбӨal c．iii § 19．（b）Chapter viii follows very naturally on c．vii．In c．vii Justin shows how the demons have caused attacks upon philo－ sophers．In c．viii he adds that he himself（a philosopher）expects the same fate $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\delta} \tau \iota \nu$ os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu a \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ （i．e．one of the demons＇servants）．
If c．viii followed on c．ii it would not be very clear who were referred to in $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\omega} \nu o \mu a \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ．We should have to hark back to c．$i$ and find the reference there．（c）In c．ix Justin takes up the idea that eternal fire is a vain threat．This perhaps would follow better on c．vii than c．viii would．But it is to be noted that in c．ix he is definitely turning to a new objection in the words
 a sort of parenthesis，Justin taking the opportunity for a hit at Crescens and for a personal explanation．

It seems therefore that the reasons for the transposition are scarcely strong enough to justify so entire a desertion of the MS order．There is no possible explanation of the way in which the chapters could have been altered to the order in which they now stand in the MSS， except the improbable theory of sheer error．The transposition would never have been suggested but for Eusebius＇words．And his statement is not decisive enough， nor is his authority sufficiently strong，to entitle us to make the change．
4．$\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s$ ồv］All editors quote Tert．ad Scap． 5 ＇Arrius




















$$
8 \text { тov̂ } \mu \grave{\eta} \text { Perion Sylburg tô̂ kal A }
$$

Antoninus in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius ciuitatis Christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait
 ขoùs ท̉ Bpoxous è $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$,' To court martyrdom in fanatical zeal, or presumption, or morbid ambition, was not unknown in the days of Christian persecution, and is censured by many Church fathers.
6. $\pi \rho о є \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] Cf. i 10, 1. Some editors suspect $\pi \rho о є \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ here to be a gloss, and certainly it might easily have been inserted. But no one would have suspected it except on a priori grounds.
ib. $\dot{\pi} \pi \alpha \hat{\mu} \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta \alpha c]$ The middle is used by classical writers in the sense of 'to be displeased'; but this
may be passive.
7. $\epsilon i$ oひ̂v $k \tau \lambda$.] Justin's view of suicide is that it is a shirking of the responsibility belonging to a member of corporate humanity, and as such contrary to the will of God.
15. $\pi \rho o \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \psi \epsilon \omega s$ ] 'prejudice.'

4(5). Yous ask why God allows. us to be persecuted. The answer is that God intrusted the government of the world to angels; these by unnatural union with twomen produced the demons who enslaved mankind. Poets and mythologists ignorantly ascribe this result to their God and the sons and brothers of their God.
16. $\dot{\eta}$ t'vyota avit $\eta$ ] This was a common argument against Christianity. Maran quotes Clem. Strom.
 $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \delta \mu \in \nu 0 t$; фабі.








 $\tau a ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ ठıà фо́ß











1. Tà oủpávia $\sigma \tau 0 \backslash \chi \in i ̂ a]$ 'The celestial elements' i.e. the sun, moon, and stars (object of $\kappa 0 \sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ ). They
 Ep. ad Diogn. 7, Theoph. ad Autol. 14.
2. ஸ̀ $\rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau$.] Cf. i 1 I3, 2.
3. of $\left.\delta^{\prime} a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o c\right]$ Cf. Gen. vi $1-42$ a piece of 'unassimilated mythology' (Delitzsch) intended to explain a legendary race of giants. The oldest interpretation treated the phrase there used, 'the sons of God,' as referring to semi-divine beings. (So the LXX and the book of Enoch vi 2 ; cf. Jude 6.) The Targums supposed it to denote the young men of the upper classes, who married maidens of the lower classes. Many Christian expositors have taken it to mean a union be-
tween sons of Seth and daughters of Cain. See Driver Genesis ad loc. Justin's theory reappears in many Church fathers (the list is given in Turmel Hist. de la théologie positive c. 9) but is rejected by Origen and others. Cf. also Joseph. Ant. i 3 .
ib. $\quad$ vvauк $\omega$ ข $\mu l \xi \in \sigma \iota \nu]$ Cf. i 5,2
 But here he speaks of the fathers of the $\delta$ aimoves.
II. द̇vסєєîs $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu$.] i.e. the demons. Thirlb. quotes Porphyry de Abstin. ii p. 204 to a similar effect.


4. $\pi$. кal $\mu \nu \theta$.] Cf. above i 23, 54 .
5. els aủtòv tòv $\theta$ धò̀ ктл.] ' in ipsum Deum (i.e. Zeus) ac in eos qui


 $\lambda \omega \nu$ каі тоі̂ऽ тє́кขоья єै $\theta \epsilon \tau о$, тробпүо́рєvбаข.



 1о $\pi \rho о \sigma \rho \eta$ й $\sigma \iota \varsigma$. 3. ó סè viòs éкєívov, ó $\mu$ óvos $\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu \in \nu o s$

tum ipsius satu geniti, tum ex eius fratribus Neptuno et Plutone corumque filiis procreati ferebantur, ea transtulere (Maran). 'A $\overline{\frac{\beta}{2}} \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $\tau \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ are parallel to aú $o \hat{v}$, governed by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$, but the whole sen= tence is decidedly clumsy.
6. ठvóparı үà $\rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Cf. i 5,2$, where it is said that the 'demons' (the word is probably used in the wider sense, including fallen angels as well as their offspring) call themselves by name.

5 (6). God has no name, but only a title. The Son has no name before the Incarnation, but only the title Christ, as agent in Creation; at the Incarnation $H e$ is named Jesus, which means Saviour; and His power is still to be seen in miraculous cures.
5. ठ̀оца $\delta \epsilon \in$ ] Cf. i 10, 1. The same idea is found in Plat. Tim. 28 c.
ib. $\theta \epsilon \tau \delta \nu$ ] explained by $\tau \partial \nu \nu \epsilon$ $\mu \in \nu o \nu$ below.
10. $\dot{\delta}$. vids кт入.] For a discussion of this passage see Introd. p. xxiv. 'But His Son, who is alone properly called Son, the Word who is with God and is (not $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon i$ s) begotten before the Creation, when in the beginning God created and set in order everything through Him, is called Christ...the name Christ also containing an incomprehensible
meaning, just as the title "God" is not a name, but the opinion, innate in human nature, of an inexpressible reality.' Cf. Col. i 15 ff , and John i 1 - 3 . Justin takes the title Christ as referring not merely to the Messianic office, but to the office of agent in Creation. The words кarà $\tau \delta \kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. are translated by Otto 'quia unctus est et per eum deus onnia ornauit.' But the construction of the Greek, so rendered, is very awkward; and the sense is not good; Christ's being anointed has nothing obvious to do with His part in Creation. It is possible that Grabe and others are right in making $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota$ here active in meaning (like $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \iota \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ and other words), though I know of no parallel use of this word. There is a close connexion between $\chi \rho t \epsilon \tau \nu$ and коб$\mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$. K $\sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ clearly bears, along with the thought of order, the notion of adornment ; and for the use of $\chi \rho i \epsilon \tau \nu$ in this sense cf. Theoph. ad Autol. i 12, a passage which also suggests that etymological exactness is not to be expected in such cases. And this use of $\kappa \in \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota$ is the more possible, because the active form кєұрєкє́vą would be a clumsy word. If this theory be rejected, Scaliger's emendation or something like it seems very possible.





 є’ $\mu \phi \nu \tau о \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{\sim} \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu ~ \delta o ́ \xi a . ~ 4 . ~ ' I \eta \sigma o v ̂ \varsigma ~ \delta є ̀ ~$


 $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ ả $\nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \kappa a i$ є̇тi ката入v́ $\sigma є \iota \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$.







 Saímovas．



7．＇I $\eta$ бoûs］Cf．i 33，7̣，Matt．i 21．Possibly also there is a play upon the resemblance between＇I $\eta \sigma o u$ us and ióouat，such as is found in Clem． Paedag．iii 12 § 98，Eus．Dem．Eu． iv 10 § 19，Cyr．Jer．Catech．x 4 and $\mathrm{I}_{3}$（Otto）．
9．ìs $\pi \rho \circ \underline{\epsilon} \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ］Cf．i 23，2； 63， $10,16$.

12．каi עv̂v кт入．］Cf．Tryph． 85.
18．ld́бavтo кт入．］This phe－ nomenon of the expulsion of demons by Christian exorcism is frequently referred to by the Church fathers． （See Tryph．30，49，76， 85 and Otto＇s note at the last－mentioned passage，as well as here．Otto also refers to Tert．$A p .23,27,32,37$ ，

Iren．c．Haer．ii 32， 4 ff．，Cypr．ad Demetr．15，Orig．Cels．i 46，67， August．de Ciu．Dei xxii 8．）It seems antecedently probable that the power of exorcism，if it ever existed in apostolic times，con－ tinued for some time in the Church ； and the consensus of patristic opinion is general．But it is not denied that the fact of exorcism can be explained scientifically．

6 （7）．It is for the Christians＇ sake that God delays the end of the world；which however will happen， though not by necessity，as the Stoics assert；nor is human conduct fated， but men have free－will and responsi－ bility．The Stoic ethic allows for
















this，but their metaphysic does away either with God or with the dis－ tinction between virtue and vice．

I．$\delta \theta \in \nu]$ A vague term，poin t－ ing back to the beginning of 4 （5） $\epsilon l$ $\delta \epsilon$ t $\tau \iota v$, and subsequently ex－ plained in $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \sigma \pi, \tau$ ．X．For the idea cf．i 28 and 45 ．

4．ठ̀ $\gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］an am－ biguous phrase．It might mean ＇which He（God）knows is the reason in nature＇i．e．＇is the reason why nature is not destroyed＇；but this explanation of Otto＇s seems feeble． Duncker（quoted by Veil）explains it＇which He recognizes as the cause in nature，＇i．e．as the efficient cause of all true life．This is not con－ vincing；and possibly a better ex－ planation is to be found in taking
 and 45）to include the idea of $\pi \rho о \gamma เ \nu \omega ் \sigma \kappa \epsilon$ ．The object of $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega}-$ $\sigma \kappa є \iota$ will then be not $\delta \tau \iota$ but directly $\delta=\tau \delta \delta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau$ ．X $\rho$ ．The verb would be used in the same kind of sense
as in I Cor．viii 3；Gal．iv 9；Matt． vii 23 ；God＇knows＇the seed of the Christians $\epsilon v \nu \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon t$ ，which might mean＇in the race＇or＇in its place in nature．＇Because of the place which it occupies in history or in nature，God delays the end． After this örı might be taken as $=$ ＇because＇or as secondary object to ү七шыбкєє．

6．таûta Étı кт入．］＇to do and be impelled to these things．＇

7．кarє $\lambda \theta 6 \nu$ ］Probably based on Gen．xix 24.

10．N $\hat{\omega} \epsilon$ ］Identified with Deu－ calion by Philo（de Praem．et Poen． p． 412 ，Mangey），Theophilus（ad Autol．ii 30）and others．

12．oút $\omega$ ］＇in the manner just described，＇including God＇s will．

13．of इтшїкol］Cf．i． 20.
ib．кат т $\tau \nu \kappa \kappa \lambda$. ．］＇by a lave of the permutation of all things into one another．＇

16．каторөо仑̂ ］a favourite word with the Stoics．


















 $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ Thirlb $\tau \sigma \delta \epsilon \mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{A}$
2. $\Sigma \omega k \rho a ́ r \eta \nu]$ Cf. i 5,46 .
3. इapoaváma入ov] A king of Assyria, celebrated for his effeminacy, who at last burnt himself with his treasures.
6. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} 8 \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The theory of free-will alone justifies the punishment of the wicked. Cf. i 28.
12. кal $\delta \ell v a \mu \nu$ ] The кal 'also' is curiously out of its place.
16. $\left.\epsilon^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{\eta} \dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda 6 \gamma \omega\right]$ The Stoic ethic is inconsistent with the Fatalism of the Stoic metaphysic.
17. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\dot{\alpha} \sigma$.] i.e. that $\sigma \dot{\omega}-$ $\mu a \tau a$ are the $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi a l$ of everything, by necessity, and that there are no such things as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$. Ashton cites Plut. Plac. Phil. i 28 and 11 ; Laert. 7, 149 and 134; Orig. Cels. p. 325; Eus. Praep. Eu. 15,14 and 15 .
18. єủoooiv ] 'to be right.' In classical Greek the passive is more usual in this sense.
ib. el'te $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Maran supposes the apodosis to begin at $\eta$ $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon ̀ \nu$ eival $\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$, and inserts кal before $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \nu$. 'If human actions are due to fate, either there is no God except transitory matter, and so the Stoics only acknowledge corruptible things and involve God with evil, or there is no virtue and vice.' This makes good sense, but it not only requires the insertion of kal, but also treats elite as if it were simply $\epsilon$. It would indeed be in some cases possible to understand the alternative to $\epsilon l \tau \epsilon-$ ' or (if they deny this, understood).' But it would be harsh to do this when there are alternatives expressed, as

 $\mu \epsilon \nu a$ каì ảva入vó $\mu \epsilon \nu a$ єis тà av̉тà ả $\epsilon i ́, \phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$

 $\mu \eta \delta$ èv єîvaı какíav $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \eta \nu^{\cdot}$ öтє $\kappa$ каі $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu$ $\sigma \omega ́ \phi \rho o \nu a$ eैvעoıav каì 入óyov каi vov̂̀ є̇бть．

7 （8）．I．Kai тoùs ảmò т $\omega \hat{\nu} \Sigma \tau \omega \ddot{\kappa} \hat{\omega} \nu$ סè $\delta о \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$,

 $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a \tau o v ̂ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v, \mu \epsilon \mu \iota \sigma \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon ф о \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ o ̋\langle a \mu \epsilon \nu$.



here．According to the existing text，the apodosis begins at $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ＇whether they will say that human actions are due to fate，or whether they say that God is nothing but transitory matter，the Stoics will either be found to acknowledge only corruptible things and to teach that God，etc．＇On Maran＇s inter－ pretation $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{d} \gamma \kappa \eta$ or $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ovat must be understood with $\mu \eta \dot{\delta} \epsilon \bar{\nu} \nu$ eival $\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$ and $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\text { è }} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ दlval какiav；on the ofher interpretation we must understand фグбovat or ává $\gamma \kappa \eta$ with кal aủròv
 какiav．The similar passage in i 43 ， 6 should be compared．
7 （B）．The nobility of the Stoic ethic，which is due to the Logos， caused the persecution of men tike Heraclitus and Musonius，at the instigation of the demons；and the persecution of Christians is a piece of the same policy．But the day of punishment will come．

9．$\kappa \partial \nu]$ See note p． 17 line 4： －because they were honourable，at any rate in their ethical teaching．＇

11．$\sigma \pi \xi \rho \mu a$ qoû $\lambda b \gamma o v]$ See $I n$－ trod．p．xxii．
ib．$\pi \in \phi \quad \mathrm{\nu} \in \hat{\mathrm{v}} \sigma \theta a l]$ Justin is in error．Heraclitus（ob．circ． 470 B．c．）
was not a Stoic，but a predecessor of Zeno，the founder of the Stoic school ；there is，however，a relation of thought between them．He was banished from Ephesus on political grounds，not executed．Musonius Rufus，a Stoic，was banished by Nero in A．D． 65 （Tac．Ann．xv 71 ）， but returned after his death（Tac． Hist．iii 81），and apparently lived to be known to Pliny（ $E p$ ．iii ir）． $\Pi \epsilon \phi \quad \nu \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a l$ is therefore an exag－ geration so far as these two men are concerned．But it is scarcely necessary to emend the text to $\pi \in \phi \nu \gamma a \delta \epsilon \hat{v} \theta a \iota$ ，as suggested by Veil．

12．ís $\pi \rho 0$ 亩 $\eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］Cf．i 46 ， though there is there but the vaguest of hints that Heraclitus suffered for his philosophy，in кã̃ ${ }^{2} \theta \in o l$ évo－ $\mu i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu(\S 3)$ and $\phi о \nu \epsilon i ̄ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$

 § 3）．The words $\dot{\omega} s ~ \pi \rho o \epsilon \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ here have therefore been suspected of being a gloss：but the case is hardly strong enough to justify their ex－ cision．
 6 （7）among many other passages．


 $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau \iota \kappa o \hat{v}$ 入óyov $\mu \epsilon ̂ \rho o s, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \kappa a \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \tau o ̂ ~ \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~$




















 Eus
8. $\epsilon i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ú $\pi \dot{o}$ $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] i.e. in cures of demoniacs. Cf, ii 5 (6), 6.

8 (3). I am expecting similar persecution, perhaps from Crescens, whom I have already confuted and am ready to confute again publicly before you.
14. T仑̂v فُvo $\mu \alpha \sigma \mu \epsilon ้ \nu \omega \nu$ ] i.e. one of those whom the demons instigate.
15. $\xi v i \lambda \psi]$ Unless there is something in the context to determine otherwise, $\xi$. seems always to $=$
neruus, 'stocks' of various kinds; Le Blant Les Persécuteurs p. 282; Allard Dix Leçons sur le Martyre p. 243 .
16. Kрiбкєутos] Tatian Or. 19 also has a very bad opinion of Crescens, who was a leading Cynic in Justin's time. See Introd. p. x.
21. катат $\bar{\epsilon}$ € єl] 'inveighsagainst,' 'runs us down.'
22. iסı $\omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] 'inexperienced peo$p l e$, ' as contrasted with experts.




















 Eus
 holds that катат $\ell \in \chi \in \epsilon \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is here understood，and that therefore $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\sigma v \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．is an apodosis．This is possible，but the sentence seems to run stiffly．It is perhaps better to take $\sigma \nu \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon$ with $\epsilon i$ ，and make то $\lambda \grave{v} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．the only apodosis． In that case the apodosis only refers directly to the second alternative； but that is no serious objection to this method of taking the sentence．

3．Meरa入eîov］＇magnitude，ma－ jesty，＇
ib．тotồtos］i．e．a Christian．
4．lסิ七тькरิs］＇popular，＇＇vul． gar．＇

6．Ép $\rho \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{\epsilon}$ ］In later times a tract called Quaestiones et Respon－ siones was attributed to Justin．
 infinitives depend on eliéval，and go with $\mu \varepsilon$ ．
 p．39，line 13 ．

10．Baбı入ıкд̀̀ $\delta^{\prime}$ ］Cf．i．I4， 4.
14．jцоішs，$\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon t]$ das So－ crates did dare＇i． 5 ．
15．ís $\pi \rho \circ \frac{\theta}{\phi} \phi \nu \nu$ ］in the beginning of the chapter．
ib．ф $\lambda \backslash \delta \delta o \xi o s]$ Cf．i 57.
 admirable saying of Socrates．＇Cf． Plat．Rep． 595 C ．
 єíסévar $\pi \lambda \eta ̀ \nu$ áóıaфopías.









 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ o ́ ~ a u ̛ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \eta ́ \rho, ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a u ̉ \tau a ̀ ~ a u ̛ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho a ́ т \tau \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau о \hat{v}$


 aủ $\tau \grave{a}$ aúroîs Sylburg Krüger $\tau \grave{a}$ aủrd̀ aủtŵ A Otto
I. ádcáфороv] 'indifferent.' The Cynic philosophy considered the summum bonum to be ádiáфopov, i.e. not to be absolute, but to be merely relative to circumstances.
9. Some so-called philosophers call our threats of punishment degrading terrors. But if there is no punishment, there is no God who cares for men, and no right or wrong, and the punishments of human law are unjust. It may be urged that laws differ in various places; but this is due to the demons, and right reason by itself speaks decisively about right and wrong in general.
6. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \phi \delta \beta$ ov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A common accusation, made even nowadays, that Christians are good from mere fear of hell, a charge not entirely unjustified by some popular theology and homiletics. Justin does not go deeply into the matter, but simply reasserts the truth of punishment.
10. $\omega$ s $\pi \rho 0 \notin \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ] Cf. i 28,4 , ii $6(7), 5$.
12. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda$.] 'But since lawgivers are not unjust (in inflicting punishments), nor their father (i.e. God), who teaches by reason (or by the Logos) the same conduct as they require, those who agree with them are not unjust either,' i.e. the Christians are not unjust in proclaiming eternal punishment. So Veil explains the sense. The other explanation, which Otto gives, is 'those who listen to them are not unjust'; but this seems very weak. Otto's text must be translated 'who teaches even by reason that they ought to act like Him' (cf. Matt. v 48). For Justin's use of $\sigma v \nu \tau$. cf. Tryph. 123, 130 and elsewhere.
13. $\dot{\delta}$ av̌T $\omega$ ע $\pi \alpha \tau \eta$ p] Maran quotes Philo de Sacrif. Abel 152


15. $\epsilon \dot{a} \nu \nu \delta \in \tau \iota ร \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This is the argument from the variations of the moral code. Cf. Plat. de Legg. ii 661 D.





 óp $O$ òs $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \pi a \rho є \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ ov̉ $\pi a ́ \sigma a s ~ \delta o ́ \xi a s ~ o u ́ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu t a ~ \delta o ́ \gamma-~$




10. 1. Мєүа入єוóтєра $\mu$ èv oûv $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i o v ~$



## 

7. ठopòs $\lambda$ bros $]$ Maran understands this to refer to the Incarnate Logos. It seems a possible inference from the use of the word $\pi a \rho \in \lambda \theta \omega \nu$, but it is not unavoidable. It may be a mere appeal to the moral reason of mankind. 'When the truth (incarnate or not) comes to men (undisturbed by the demons).'
8. Our teaching surpasses all other, because in Christ the whote Logos became incarnate, which had previously been known only fragmentarily; and those who then used it were punished. But they persuaded none to die for their belief; Christ persuades not only philosophers, but all classes of men, to do so.
 translates 'quia totus logos exstitit Christus, qui propter nos apparuit, nempe corpus et logos et anima,' i.e. 'because Christ was, etc.' The notion then is that the Incarnate Christ was the whole Logos. If, however, revovevar be taken to mean 'became' or 'was made,' the rendering of Dorner (Person of Christ Per, i

Ep. 2 § I) and Veil must be right ; 'because the whole of the rational principle (of the universe) became the Christ who appeared for our sakes, body, logos, and soul.' Otto's omission of an article with the infinitive $\gamma \in \gamma \quad{ }^{2}$ évą is surely wrong.
 (loc. cit.) discusses the question whether Justin conceived of Christ as having a human soul. Since $\psi u x \eta$ means 'the animal principle,' it would seem as if $\lambda 6$ oov meant the Divine Logos in place of a human $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$. But it is a mistake thus to read back the subject-matter of later controversy into Justin's words. $\Sigma \omega \mu a$, $\lambda$ óyos, $\psi u \chi \dot{\eta}$, are the three departments in which the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \nu \theta \rho \omega^{-}-$ $\pi \eta \sigma$ os took place. The division is in the main a dichotomy; the words are not all three in the ascending scale. In the invisible half Justin begins with 'reason,' the rational soul, and then adds the animal soul. All that he means is that $\tau 6$ 入oyıкò became wholly man.

каi 入óyov каi 廿uхそ́v．




















 ảтò $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \iota ~(\lambda u ́ \gamma o s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \eta ̉ \nu ~ \kappa a i ~ \epsilon ै \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ o ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ \pi a \nu \tau i ~$





 forcible．＇

10．є̇vєк入 $\eta$ $\theta \eta$ ］＇was accused．＇Cf． Plat．Apol． 24 B，and see above i 5 ． 12．ס̀ סè $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇But he，by eject－$ ing Homer and other poets from his ideal state（cf．Plat．R＇ep．Bks ii and x ），taught men to renounce the evil demons，who had done the deeds of which the poets spoke，and urged them to know the God，whom they
did not know，by rational inquiry．＇ Cf．note p．8，line II．

16．тô̂ ả $\gamma \nu$ ．］Acts xvii 23.
17．$\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ p a \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］A verb－ ally incorrect quotation from Plat． Tim． 28 c．

22．$\lambda o ́ y o s ~ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ ' F o r ~ H e$. was and is the Logos，who is in ererybody，and who foretold the future by the prophets and in person when He became，etc．＇The last clause каi $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}$ ．is not regularly logical．



 5 катабкєขท.










 $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \dot{v} \forall \hat{v} \varsigma \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ o ̋ \psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ o v ̂ \sigma a \nu, ~ \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon ̂ \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ ' H \rho а к \lambda \epsilon ́ a ~$





3. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'Since it (namely, the doctrine of Christ, implied in $\delta \iota \delta d \xi a \nu \tau o s ~ \tau a \hat{\tau} a)$ is the power of the ineffable Father, and not an artifice of human reason.' See above 14, 5; 60, 11 . Cf.Ep. ad Diogn. 7
 таûta סúvauis éatı $\theta$ єov̂. Cf, also ${ }_{1}$ Cor. i 18 ; Rom. i 16. Another rendering is 'since He was the power, etc.,' but in this case the word ката$\sigma \kappa є v \eta$ would be unsuitable.
11. Death is the debt of nature, and we do not mind paying the deht. But we are like all who follow virtue, in that we despise pleasure and have
no fear of death.
8. кai $\theta a v \in i ̂]$ Cf. note, $p, 16$, line 1. Otto suggests that $\kappa a r \theta a-$ $\nu \in i v$ may be the right reading.
 ii 1 .
II. ádpalvovias] A poetic word, used later as a philosophic term.
 know of no other instance of this word. Its formation is very curious. ' Ad amorem eliciendum apto et florescente ex illis ornamentis uultu.' (Otto.)
16. $\theta \in \lambda \kappa \tau \leftarrow \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. .] 'immediately seductive to the eyes.'











$8 \mu \nu \mu$. dं $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \omega \nu$ Maran Goez Otto $\mu \mu \mu . \phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ A Sacr Par Holl ioi



1. Tरी $\pi \tau \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\beta 0 \lambda}{ } \hat{\eta}]$ 'vesture.',
2. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\rho} \notin o v \tau t]$ ' transitory.'

4- кai \#ávè' ف̀vz.] 'And we are persuaded that everyone, who flees what is superficially fair and follows what is thought hard and foolish, finds happiness awaiting him (evodat$\mu o v(a \nu$ is the subject of $\hat{\varepsilon} \delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \chi$.). For Vice, veiling her actions in the beauties which properly belong to Virtue and are genuine (though only by imitation of incorruptible things, for she possesses and can produce nothing which is incorruptible) enslaves grovelling men, clothing Virtue in the ugliness which properly belongs to herself.' The idea is that Vice offers all the attractions which properly belong to Virtue, and deceives men into seeing Virtue clad in all the unattractiveness which properly belongs to Vice. But her assumed attractions are a mere copy of the true attractions of Virtue, and are impermanent. Justin's thought may be infuenced by passages like Plat. Rep. i1 $3^{61}$ and ix 591, where the question of the benefits of Virtue, apart from rewards, is considered. Veil retains $\mu \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} \phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, supposing Justin
to distinguish between the corruptible and the incorruptible attractions of Virtue (e.g. practical advantages on the one hand and spiritual blessings on the other) ; Vice assumes the former but not the latter. This is possible, but seems somewhat too subtle. And could it be said that Vice veiled herself with $\tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \delta \nu \tau \omega \mathrm{s}$
 corruptible attractions? The point surely is, that Vice makes a show of giving all the blessings, which Virtue really can give, but that her attractions are delusive and transitory, whilst those of Virtue are permanent.
11. ol $\delta$ ѐ עєעопко́тєs кт入.] 'But they who perceive the true beauties that belong to Virtue are also incorruptible through her help.' Perhaps, however, it is simpler to make $\tau \hat{\varphi}$
 We are now a long way from $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta}$, and another $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho$. has occurred meanwhile. It would also suit the argument, 'Those who have caught the beauties belonging to true existence become themselves incornuptible by means of virtue.'

 тоьаиิта $\pi \rho a \xi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，óтоі̂a єैфабаע oi тоıทтаì $\pi \epsilon \rho i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 єौ兀коขта．












#### Abstract

$2 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Otto $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$ ．каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{A} \| 3$ そ̇фaбav Perion     


2．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial}$ тoû à $\theta \lambda o v$ ］＇athletes，＇ as types of men who choose labour， without caring for death，and re－ nounce pleasure．The Greek phrase is a curious one．It looks as if $\alpha 0 \lambda$ ou must be used in the sense of＇arena，＇from $\dot{a} \theta \lambda$ os，not $\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda o \nu$.
ib．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］i．e． heroes，like Hercules，not those demigods of another character，re－ ferred to in i 2 I ．

5．$\lambda о \boldsymbol{\iota} \sigma \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ є่ $\lambda \kappa$ ．］＇arsuing from the fait，elc．＇；groing with mávea ขоw $\epsilon \chi \eta$ ．

12．Even when $I$ was a Pla－ tonist，I used to dishelieve the popular charges against Christians，because their lives and their readiness for
death seemed inconsistent with those accusations．But，if Christians did the acts alliged against them，they might call them mysteries of Cronos or Jupiter，and show that their con－ duce zevas only like to what is done openly by pagans．

12．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \omega \nu$ $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \beta о \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu]$ Cf．i 26， 7.

13．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủtoû aं $\gamma$ ．］Cf．Luke xvi 25.

15．oú $\chi$ ठ̊т $\quad \gamma \epsilon$ ］＇nedum．＇The Christian does this when he con－ fesses himself to be a Christian．

16．そंठ to what follows．$\Delta \iota a ́ \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \pi o \nu \eta \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} 0 \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \pi \omega \nu$ refers probably to the anti－Christian agitators，like Cres－
$\gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$ oi $\phi a \hat{\lambda} \lambda_{o \iota} \delta a i ́ \mu o v \in \varsigma \delta \iota a ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \pi o \nu \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ $\pi \rho a \chi$ ض̂val．4．фovev́ovtes，yàp aủtoí tıvas èmì бvкo－










cens．Aúroi must refer to the $\pi$ rov $\eta$－ pol $\nless \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o l$ ，though grammatically it should refer to the $\delta a i \mu o v \in s$ ． Veil suspects the whole passage $\eta \delta \eta$ кal．．．$\pi$ ра́ттоиб兀» to be a gloss of a later writer，who was influenced by a reminiscence of the Epist． Vienn．et Lugd．（ap．Eus．H．E． v I），where it is said $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu о \nu \tau o$


 каi Oiठıтобєious $\mu i \xi \epsilon \iota$ ．Veil＇s reasons for suspicion are partly that $\mathfrak{a}$ aúrol
 rude，being an insult to the rulers， to whom the Apology is addressed； but I see no reason for thinking that the rulers are meant by aúrol；and partly that Athenagoras（Leg．25） definitely says $\delta 00 \hat{\lambda}$ o $\ell \in i \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu . . .0 \cup \cup s$

 катє廿єن́бато．The contradiction with Athenagoras seems strange； there is nothing to show（as Ashton suggests）that Athenagoras is refer－ ring only to Christian slaves，whilst Justin is speaking of Gentile slaves （whom the Epistle quoted above definitely specifies）．But Athena－ goras may quite well have been ignorant of facts which were known
to Justin；or he may be exag－ gerating his case．The case for treating the passage as a gloss is really frivolous；and if a gloss is to be discovered，it should be carried down to $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \omega \nu$ ；for，if it be cut short at $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu$ ，it is not easy to see what $\omega^{\nu} \nu$ oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ refers to；pre－ sumably it would have to be to $\phi i \lambda \eta^{-}$ סovos кт入．

Ir．Kpovov $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho[a]$ The evi－ dence for human sacrifice in the cult of Cronos is strong；for that reason he was later identified with Moloch．The Latin Saturnus cor－ responds to the Greek Cronos．For the authorities cf．Farnell Greek Cults vol．i c． 3 ．

12．$\left.\tau \dot{\alpha} \psi^{2} \sigma \alpha\right]$ governed by $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ． This is a reference to the worship of Jupiter Latiaris ；many Christian writers allude to the practice of human sacrifice as existing in this cult，e．g．Tert．Apol．9，but Wissowa （Religion der Römer p． 109 n．3）is emphatically sceptical on the point． It is not mentioned by any heathen writer，except Porphyry（de Abstin．
 кат тウ̀ $\nu \quad \mu \varepsilon \gamma a ̈ \lambda \eta \nu \quad \pi 6 \lambda \iota \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta}$ тov̂
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi{ }^{2}$ ；















 5. $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, \sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu і \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$.

 єl ठछ Kal $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \tau s \hat{\eta}_{\nu} \mathrm{A}$
3. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \imath \sigma \ldots \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \rho \dot{\partial} s]$ i.e. consul or prefect.
4. Tज̂v фovevévitcu] i.e. the fighters with wild beasts, as we learn from Tert. Apol. 9 .
11. $\theta \in \dot{o} \nu \ldots \delta i \kappa$, oi $\delta$.] Cf. I Pet. ii 23 .
12. єille $\kappa \alpha l \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The text here is uncertain. The use of $a v$ in a wish is not normal, and possibly
 Veil prefers a suggestion of Buecheler, who reads $\epsilon l$ ò $\ldots \ldots \eta \nu$ (according to the mS) and $\alpha^{2} \nu \epsilon \beta \sigma \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, translating 'but if there were one (some $\epsilon \pi \delta \pi \tau \eta$ s $\delta$ (kuoss), he would, etc.,' thus making the sentence a covert appeal to the rulers. But this expansion of $\tau$ ts seems harsh, and possibly Otto's text is open to least objection. Otto compares

Plat. Clitoph. 407 A, where Socrates is represented $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ $\tau \rho a \gamma \kappa \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \epsilon 6$, exclaiming $\pi 0 \hat{\imath} \phi \hat{\epsilon}$ -


15. $\pi \epsilon \rho \prec \beta \dot{\beta} \lambda \lambda$ доутєs] Cf. above ii 11,7 .
16. тoútous $\check{\nu}$ ] 'to these, who have no part in them.' Certainly, as Veil suggests, ois toút $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ would be more natural.
13. I think scorn of the demons' falsehoods about us. I declare that in Christianity all past truth is summed up. Previous thinkers had only a seed of the Logos; we have in Christ the whole Logos.
18. $\mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'perceiving that discredit had been cast by the demons over the Divine doctrines of Christianity, in order to avert other men


入aбa каì тท̂s тарà тoîs mo入入oîs סógクs．2．Xpıनтıàòs







 4．ö $\sigma a$ ô̂v $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ к а \lambda \omega ิ s ~ \epsilon i ̂ \rho \eta \tau a \iota, ~ \grave{\eta \mu \omega ̂ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma-~}$



 ä $\pi$ оттov edd äँ $\pi \omega \pi \tau 0 \nu \mathrm{~A}$
from them．＇For $\pi \epsilon \rho[\beta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ cf．ii 11， 7.
 by катє $\epsilon \in \lambda a \sigma a$ ．
 mean＇boast＇or＇declare＇as in i ${ }^{15}, 6$ ，and this suits the sense well． But here，being joined by the double
 more naturally taken to mean＇pray．＇ For the sentiment cf．Phil．iii 9 f． Ign．Eph．I qva $\delta v \nu \eta \theta \omega \hat{\omega} \mu a \theta \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime}$ s elval with Lightfoot＇s note．
7．oúk $\begin{array}{c}\text { zort } \\ \pi\end{array}$ ．ö $\left.\mu.\right]$＇they are not altogether the same，＇i．e．as Christ＇s teaching．
9．ëкабтоs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \iota s \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇for each， by having a share in the Divine Logos，spoke well，whenever he saw what was congruous to it．＇Or could $\tau \delta \sigma u \gamma \gamma \in \nu$ ès here mean＇homo－ geneous＇（as in Aristotle），as con－ trasted with what follows？For the idea cf．ii 8 and ro．Note that
grammatically $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{\partial} \mu_{0}$ ．belongs to ỏp $\omega$ ．

10．Tảvavtía é．］Cf．i 44，Io； ii 10,3 ．

II．äтоттov］probably means ＇hidden．＇

13． $\begin{gathered}\text { ora oûv } \kappa \tau \lambda \text { ．］A fine claim }\end{gathered}$ of the summing up of all things in Christ．Cf．I Cor．iii 2I f．Aubé （S．Justin p．100）points，out that Seneca makessimilar claims；＇Quid－ quid bene dictum est ab ullo，meum est＇（Epist．ad Lucil．xvi sub fin．）； ＇quod uerum est，meum est＇（ $E$ pist． xii）．But Seneca only claims all discovered truth as his heritage． The Christian claim is that all truth is actually his possession，as being the revelation of the Logos， and so that all truth is Christian truth．

15．$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ T \partial ̀ \nu \theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$ ］The Logos is second in liturgical precedence：See Introd．p．xxii．









 aitià $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta u \nu o ̀ ~ \tau a i ̂ s ~ \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho i ́ a u s ~ \gamma i v o v t a \iota ~[\epsilon i s ~ т o ̀ ~ \gamma \nu \omega-~$



 $\tau \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ A $\| \frac{13}{} \gamma^{\nu} \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ Sylb Otto $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu \mathrm{A}$

 A comparison with James i 21 might favour the former view, and it may be correct, though above ii 8 , I we

 this passage the addition of $\epsilon \nu$ ov́ $\sigma \eta$ s somewhat alters the turn of the phrase.
3. á $\mu v \delta \rho \omega \bar{s}]$ ' dimly.'
4. Étepoy $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] explaining $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \delta \hat{\omega} s$. 'It is one thing to have the seed of a thing and to be enabled to imitate it according to one's capacity; the thing itself, so partaken in and imitated by virtue of its owen favour, is quite another.' The principle is stated in general terms; but of course the point is that there is a difference between the $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$ of the Logos and the Logos itself, i.e. Christ sums up all the truth of past times.
14. We ask you to publish this address, that others may know our
doctrines and be saved from the punishment, to which their persecution of us makes them liabie.
7. ímoर $\left.a^{\prime} \psi a \nu \tau a s\right]$ A libellus was presented to the rulers, who, if they wished, placed a comment at the end and had it published, cf. i 29, 3. See e.g. the libelli from the Decian persecution.
10. $\pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ éaut $\omega$ 人 aitiav] 'through their own fault.' Cf. Tryph. 88.
II. $\epsilon l s \tau \delta \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] These words are intolerably tautologous.
12. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The reasons why the persecutors are liable to punishment (from God) are: (I) There is in man a capacity for recognizing right and wrong; (2) They condemn men on mere suspicion without knowledge ; (3) They worship gods who commit and permit, nay demand ( $\dot{a} \pi a c-$ тои̃ı) the immoralities which are charged against Christians.






 ن́ $\mu \epsilon i \hat{\varsigma}$ тои̂то $\pi \rho о \gamma \rho a ́ \psi \eta \tau \epsilon$, $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ ф а \nu \epsilon \rho o ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \nu ~ \pi o \iota-~$

 ס̀̀ $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ тà $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a ~ к а т a ̀ ~ к р i ́ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \sigma \omega ́ ф \rho о \nu a ~ a i \sigma \chi \rho a ́, ~$ à $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \sigma \eta s ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \phi ı \lambda o \sigma o \phi i ́ a s ~ a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i ́ o v ~ v i \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau \epsilon \rho a \cdot ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \delta e ̀ ~$





 ঠрхŋбтккоîs A
3. 亡́s $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \tau<\hat{v} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Since Christians are punished on suspicion of doing deeds which the heathen themselves commit, the heathen are condemning themselves.
15. We pray that our apology. may become known; for our teaching is better than any human philosophy, or, at least, than the poems which you allow anyone to read.
6. каl той ктл.] These words are obviously out of place, and must be a marginal note which has strayed into the text. Their proper place seems to be in ii 13, after $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$ r. $\pi$. $\delta 6$ ह̄ךs. Cf. Tryph. 120.
8. $\left.\pi \rho 0 \gamma \rho \alpha^{\prime} \psi \eta \tau \epsilon\right]$ either 'to $p u b$ lish,' in the sense that the emperors put it forth officially; or else 'to proscribe.' The latter fits the context, which contrasts the $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{i}$ is with the $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{ei} \mathrm{s}$.
ib. $\pi o \neq \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu]$ without ${ }^{2} \nu$ must be a wish, which would be very strange in this place. Otto translates (without inserting $a \partial \nu$ ) ' nos $u t$ in omnium notitiam ueniat curabimus,' which is a paraphrase, scarcely justified by the MS reading.
13. $\sigma \omega T a \delta \in$ iloss] Sotades of Maronea was the author of obscene verses.
ib. фi入aıvideios] Philaenis of Leucatide was the authoress of a poem $\pi \varepsilon \rho l$ á $\phi p o \delta i \not \approx\{\omega \nu$.
 of Gela wrote a gastronomic poem called 'H $\delta u \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota a$. Some prefer to retain here the ms $\delta \rho \chi \eta \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o i s s ~ a s ~$ referring to ballets, and $\gamma \in \nu \quad \mu \in \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{o s}$, meaning 'acted.' But evidently a proper name was wanted.
14. ह̇тıкоиpeloss] the teachings of Epicurus.






I. $\lambda_{\epsilon}$ outports] It is, of course, only by a kind of zeugma that this

2. $\quad \forall \sigma o \nu{ }^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu$.] Cf. i 55,8 .
3. Toùs $\pi$ áv $\nu \eta \pi$. ad.] Cf. I Tim. ii 4 .
4. $\dot{\alpha} \xi i \omega s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ r e f e r s ~ b a c k ~ t o$. the epithets of the dedication i $\mathbf{I}$.
5. $\dot{\varepsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ This is in accordance with Justin's general idea, that the rulers' own case, i.e. the case of their own salvation, is in question. Cf. i 8, i, Text. ad Sap. I 'Hunc libellum non nobs timentes mistmus, ed uobis et omnibus inimicis nostris.'

## APPENDIX I.

The following letters appear in the mSS after i 68. But there is every reason to doubt their authenticity. The first appears in Eus. H.E. iv 13 in a very different version, as written by Marcus Aurelius. It cannot have been extant in Justin's time, though it may have been added to the Apology before the time of Eusebius. It is needless to discuss whether it proceeds from Pius or Aurelius, as it is almost certainly a forgery. It is not referred to by Melito in Eus. H. E. iv 26 (though he enumerates the rescripts of Hadrian and Pius on the subject of the Christians), and it is quite an unsuitable and unconvincing composition. The view which it takes of the gods is wholly frivolous and unbecoming to Pius or Aurelius, its laudation of the Christians as innocent models of religious fidelity and zeal, and the facts suggested in $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} v$ $\dot{o}^{\circ} \chi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$., are unhistorical and untrue.

The second letter cannot have been inserted by Justin, who was long dead, since it refers to events that must have taken place about A.D. 174. It is an obvious forgery. Eus. H.E. v 5 only knows of its existence from Tertullian ${ }^{1}$. The Greek is barbarous, and the circumstances a palpable absurdity. The fact referred to seems to be the deliverance of the Roman army in Hungary, during the campaign against the Quadi, by a sudden shower, as pictured in a sculpture on the column of Aurelius. This was attributed by the heathen to the gods of Rome, to an Egyptian sorcerer, or to the Emperor's own prayers. The Christian legend of the Legio Fulminata is a mere fiction. The name was an old one, being known in Augustus' time, and, though the event related in the legend

[^34]was said to have diverted Aurelius from his purposes of cruelty towards the Christians, the Gallic persecution of A.D. 177 is a proof that such a supposition was equally fictitious ${ }^{1}$.

The text of the subjoined epistles is that of Otto.
'A $\nu \tau \omega \nu i \nu o v ~ ' E \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к о \iota \nu o ̀ v ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ ' A \sigma i ́ a s . ~$





















r. кoıvбv] The common council of Asia, which supervised the provincial affairs and the cult of Caesar.
 $\tau \delta \delta^{\prime}, \pi$. $\pi a \tau \rho(\delta o s]$ Mommsen (=A.D. 158). $\quad \delta \eta \mu_{0} \dot{\epsilon} \xi$. ジ $\pi a \tau o s \pi \delta^{\prime}$, тат. $\pi a \tau \rho(\delta o s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к а ́ ~ A . ~$
5. ช̋т८... $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a c]$ A similar anacoluthon in Tryph. 45 is pointed
${ }^{1}$ See the discussion of the whole subject in Lightfoot Ignatius i 465 foll. (ed. 1).

















 тòv каì тò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os тò $\epsilon \in \mu o ̀ v ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu ' ́ \gamma \epsilon \theta o s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \beta \alpha \rho \beta \alpha ́ \rho \omega v ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$






9. $\sigma к о \pi о \hat{v} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \epsilon \theta \eta$ ] i.e. his plans against Marcomannia and Sarmatia.
ib. ò $\pi$ oìa èv $\tau \hat{\eta} k \tau \lambda$.] 'such advantages as $I$ won out of the danger of being surrounded.'
11. канஸ̀v каі $\pi \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ] Scalig. ка $\mu$. каi $\sigma \pi a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \mathrm{~A}$.
ib. Kapдoúvтч] Otto, котivц A. Aurelius had his headquarters for three years at Carnuntum during the Marcomannic war.
12. $\delta \rho a \kappa 6 \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ Mythical, unless it refers figuratively to the enemy.

Or the idea may be of 7 legions, each with io standards with dragons thereon (Salmasius). Scaliger suggests $\delta$ poú $\gamma \kappa \omega \nu$, drungus being a late Latin name for a barbarian cohort.
14. Поит ${ }^{\text {iav }}$ bs] Son-in-law of Aurelius and his general in Rhaetia and Noricum.
16. $\gamma \in \mu i p a s, ~ \phi \rho \in \nu \tau \eta \sigma i a s$ Otto, $\gamma \epsilon \mu \iota \nu \alpha \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \sigma i \notin \mathrm{~A} . \quad \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \iota \nu=$ fretense.
25. $\delta \theta \epsilon v$ á $\rho \xi \neq \alpha \mu \in \nu o l]$ As it stands, the sentence is evidently defective.


























 $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

Perhaps the original verb is concealed in $\pi$ aр́ $\rho \tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, or è $\pi \sigma i \eta \sigma a \nu$ is lost after it.
8. äma òe $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ тoúrovs] Ottò, äua ठè $\tau \hat{\text { ̂ }}$ тoútous A.
 бодev, or some such verb.
17. $\pi \rho \sigma \delta \eta \lambda$ ov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'become clear that he is accused for no other cause.'
19. T $\tau \nu \quad \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha \gamma o \nu \tau a ~ \delta \epsilon \epsilon] ~ C f$. Dan. iii 29 , vi 24 .
20. $\sigma v \nu a \sigma \phi a \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu]$ 'proving.'
22. duve $\epsilon \in \theta$ efplav] either 'loss of freedom' or 'dishonesty' (by abjuring his faith).
25. Bitpd́olos] Brisson, Otto. B $\eta$ odecos A. Vitrasius Pollio was prefect of the praetorians from A.D. 172 .
 of the decree.

## APPENDIX II.

## HADRIAN'S RESCRIPT TO MINUCIUS FUNDANUS. (i 68.)

The genuineness of this rescript has been much disputed, e.g. by Baur, Keim, Aubé, Veil, Lipsius, Overbeck, by whom it is regarded as a Christian forgery of a later generation. On the other hand Neander, Wieseler, Funk, Renan, Mommsen, Lightfoot, Ramsay defend its authenticity without hesitation; and it seems open to question whether the doubts about it are not due to a false view of the Roman government's relations to Christianity. The arguments may be summarized as follows :
(r) It is maintained that the rescript is an anti-climax in its present position, and that the appeal to it is unworthy of Justin. But this seems over-fanciful. There is no unworthiness involved in quoting it, as Justin does, with the statement that the Christians might claim a fair trial as their legal right in accordance with it, but preferred to base their plea on considerations of abstract justice.
(2) It is pointed out that Tatian, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian make no reference to it. But this argument is quite inconclusive. Neither Justin nor Athenagoras quotes Trajan's earlier and undoubtedly authentic rescript; and Melito (A.D. 172 ) mentions Hadrian's rescript (Eus. H. E. iv 26 ).
(3) It is said to be out of accord with Hadrian's character. But that is quite untrue. Hadrian was a thorough sceptic, and this rescript, as Ramsay says (Ch. in Rom. Emp. p. 324), 'was a sarcasm.' Trajan's principle, that the Name of Christianity is a crime, is neither asserted nor rescinded by him; the State religion is left unaltered, but the practical application in the case of Christianity is left to the personal
bias of individual governors by the studied vagueness of the language, e.g. $\epsilon i ้ ~ \tau \iota s ~ \delta \epsilon i ́ k v v \sigma i ́ ~ \tau \iota ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ v o ́ \mu o v s ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau o v \tau a s ~$ might be interpreted either to include the mere proof of being a Christian or to include only definite crimes.
(4) The heading is said to be informal. But, as Allard points out (Hist. des perséc. p. 249), Trajan's letters to Pliny are headed simply Traianus Plinio S.
(5) It is said that there was no need for a change of administration ; that Trajan's letter had fixed the procedure. But the situation was now changed. In Trajan's time the Christians were subject to anonymous denunciations; now they are the objects of popular clamour ; and this rescript is an ordinance to protect public order.
(6) It is pointed out that the Latin text is more severe than the Greek, and it is argued that the Christians would not have weakened the Latin in a Greek translation ; but that a Christian translator into Latin of a Christian forgery in Greek might colour the phrases. But the differences are after all very slight, and may be due to mere ignorance or carelessness. On the whole the rescript seems quite in the line of Roman State policy. Christianity was always a religio illicita, and so Pliny assumed it to be ; the Christians disturbed the public peace and denied the State religion, and as such could be put to death. But their numbers caused anxiety as to the expediency of a general persecution of Christianity. Trajan therefore prescribed mildness in the exercise of administrative power against them. Hadrian's rescript is on similar lines. But that in no way justifies a theory that this rescript was a forgery, imitated from Trajan's. And it is very dangerous to reject not only this quotation of Justin, but also Melito's and Eusebius' quite distinct and unequivocal statements, as due to forgery or ignorance. No doubt the rescript was originally private, but it would soon have become known, like other official rescripts.

## INDEX I.

## SUBJECTS.

## A

Abraham, a Christian before Christ, 70, 12
Achilles, story of, 4I, 3
Acta of Pilate, see Pontius Pilate
Adonis, myth of, 40, 8
Agapé, possible allusion to, Ioo, 6
Amphilochus, oracle of, 30,5
Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, Christians before Christ, 70, I3
Angels, xxix sq.; 9, 13 ; 111, 5 ; fall of, xxxi; ini, 6
Antinous, deification of, 47, 13
Antiope, myth of, 40, 13
Antoninus Pius, adoption of, xlvii; character of, xvii ; 2, 8; rescript of, 131
Aphrodite, 40, 8
Apollo, 40, 6
Apologies, characteristics of Justin's, xi; date of, xlvii; editions of, liii; mss of, lii ; number of, xlix
Archestratus, 129, 13
Ariadne, myth of, 35,12
Arianism, possible, in Apologies, xxii; 52, 2
Asclepius, myth of, 35, 7; 38, 3; 40,$10 ; 82$, 10
Athena, birth of, 97,7
Aurelius, M., adoption of, xlvii; character of, xvii; 2, 8; letter of, ${ }^{131}$

## B

Baptism, Justin's account of, xxxvii; ${ }^{2} 3,6 ; 90,3$; fasting before, 90 , Io
Barcochba, ill-treatment of Christians by, 49, 17

Bellerophon, myth of, 35, 11; 82, I
Bethlehem, 54, II
Body, Resurrection of, 31, 2; 32,
3; 77, 2; see Eschatology
Briareus, Thetis and, 41, I
Briseis, Achilles and, 4I, 3

## C

Canon, Justin's evidence to, xxxiii ; see Non-canonical books
Carnuntum, Aurelius at, I33, II
Christ, name of, 5,$8 ;{ }_{11} 3,3$
Christians, popular charges against, 9, 8; $15,5,10 ; 44,1$; 73, 17 ; 117, 18; 124, II ; before Christ, 70, 10
Church organization, Justin's evidence on, xxxvi
Crescens, $x$; li; 117, 16
Cronos, cult of, 125,11 ; myth of, 36, 9
Cross, symbolism of, 55, 4; 82, 16; 88, I2
Cynics, views of, 119,1
D
David, date of, $6_{3}, 17$
Demonology, Justin's, xxix and references
Deucalion identified with Noah, I I4, 10
Dionysus, myth of, 35,$8 ; 40,6$; 81, 5
Dioscuri, 35, 10
Divorce, Justin's views on, 22, 15
Dodona, oracle at, 30, 6

## E

Elias, a Christian before Christ, 70, 13
Empedocles, eschatology of, 30, 7
Emperors, apotheosis of, 36, I; 84 , I
Epicurus, Justin's views on, xiii ; 115, 3; 126, 6; 129, 14
Erebus, 88, I
Eschatology, Justin's, xxxii and references; causes of a delay of end of world, 46,$5 ; 114,1$; see Body, Resurrection of
Ethics, Justin's views on, xxxi ; 16 , $3 ; 21,4 ; 22,19 ; 26,6 ; 44,8$; 59, 15
Eucharist, Justin's evidence on, xxxix ; $98,2,15 ; 100$, 10 ; wine or water in, xlii
Eusebius, evidence of, about Apologies, xlv
Exorcisms, Christian, 113,18
Exposure of children, Justin's views on, 44, 8 ; 47, 1

## F

Fasting before Baptism, 90, 10
Felix, Munatius, xlix; 47, 7
Free-will, Justin's views on, xxxii ; 14,$13 ; 46,9 ; 64,8 ; 114,15 ;$ and Divine foreknowledge, 63 , 14; 67, 11

## G

Ganymede, 36, II ; 40, 14
Gehenna, 33, 4
Gitta, Simon of; see Simon
God, Justin's doctrine of, xix sq. ; 9, 10; 11, 17; 13, 7; 14, 2; 20, 9; 21, 4; 34, 2; 112, 8
Gospels, 99, 6; Justin's quotations from, xxxv; knowledge of Fourth Gospel, xxi ; xxxv; 91, x ; use of, in Eucharistic service, 100, II
Granianus, 102, 20

## H

Hadrian, character of, $\mathbf{1 3 5}$; rescript of, 102, 15; 135
Helena, Marcion and, 42, 6

Heraclitus, a Christian before Christ, 70,11 ; fate of, 116,12
Herakles, choice of, 122, $\mathbf{1 2}$; story of, 35,9 ; 82, 8
Hermes, myth of, 35,$6 ; 37,5$
Herod, 49, 4 ; 6і, I
Holy Ghost, Justin's doctrine of, xxvii and references
Homer, referred to, 30,8 ; $4 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}$
Hystaspes, eschatology of, 33, 7; forbidden to be read, 68, 6

## I

Idolatry, Justin's views on, 12, 17
Incarnation, Justin's doctrine of, xxii; xxvi; 38, $12 ; 7 \mathrm{I}, 2 ; 96,6$; 113, 9; 127, 16 ; Virgin-Birth, 37. 14; 51, 26; 52, 20

## J

Jerusalem, fate of, 71, 21
Jesus, name of, 54,$2 ; 113,7$
Judah, 51, 2
Junius Rusticus, ix
Jupiter Latiaris, cult of, 125, 12
Justin, life of, ix; 124, 7 ; martyrdom of, ix; methods of quotation of, xxxy; 24, 1, 3; 26, 10, 13 ; 27,$9 ; 62,23$; origin of, ix; 1,7 ; place in history of, xii sq.; style of, xi; Apologies; Demonology; doctrine of Angels, God, Holy Ghost, Incarnation, Logos ; Eschatology; Ethics; evidence on Baptism, Canon, Church organization, Eucharist, Sunday; knowledge of Fourth Gospel, non-canonical books; possible Arianism in, Subordinationism in ; possible belief in eternity of matter; relation to Plato; views on Free-will, see separate headings

## K

Koré, myth of, 96 , 18

## L

Legio fulminata, 13 r
Logos, Justin's doctrine of, xx and references

Lot, 79, 19
Lucius, a Christian martyr, 108, 9

## M

Marcion, xlix; 43, 4; 86, 8
Marriage, Justin's views on, 47, 3; see Divorce
Matter, Justin's views on eternity of, xix ; 14, 5; 87, 16
Menander the poet, 34,14
Menander the heretic, 42,$9 ; 84$, 14
Minos, 12, 7
Minucius Fundanus, 102, 17
Mithras, mysteries of, 99, I3
Moses, first of prophets, 50,$12 ; 67$, 3; 80, 19; 87, 8; and Brazen Serpent, 88, 6
Musonius, fate of, 116, 12

## N

Noah, 114, 10
Non-canonical books, Justin's knowledge of, xxxiii; 53, II; 55, 18; 75, I; 91, I

## O

Oracles, pagan, 30, I

## P

Paganism under Empire, 7, 8; 29, $9 ; 39,8 ; 40,9 ; 45,10$; analogies to Christianity, 34,$7 ; 35,3 ; 36$, 18; 81, 7; 92, 19; 96, 17; 99, 13; 114, 10
Persephone, myth of, 40, 8
Perseus, myth of, 35,10 ; 37, 15; 82, 6
Philaenis, 129, 13
Philo, Justin and, xxi
Philosophy, Christianity regarded as, xiv ; 7, 4; 1I, 4
Pius, see Antoninus
Plato, borrowings of, from Moses, 67,$3 ; 87,4 ; 88,3$; Justin's relation to, xiii, xix; quoted, 4 , 7 ; 12, 6; 30, 8; 34, 8; 67, 2; 88, 4 ; 118, 17 ; $121,10,12,17$; teaching of, compared to Christ's, 127, 6
Pompeianus, 133,14

Pontius Pilate, 20, 4; 61, 2; 70, 5;
Acta of, 56,$5 ; 72$, 10
Prophecy, argument from, 48, 8; methods of, 56,$13 ; 63$, II
Ptolemaeus, a Christian martyr, 107, 12
Ptolemy and the Septuagint, 48, 18
Pythagoras, 30, 8
Pytho, oracle of, 30,6

## Q

Quirinius, 54, 17 ; 70, 3

## R

Reservation, xl
Resurrection of body, see Body Rhadamanthys, 12,7
Rusticus, see Junius

## S

Sardanapalus, 115,3
Satan, xxxi ; 45, 18
Sects, immoral Christian, 7, I
Semo Sancus, statue of, 42, 3
Septuagint, 49, 7
Serpent, brazen, 88, 6
Sibyl, eschatology of, 33, 7; forbidden to be read, 68,7
Simon of Gitta, 4I, II; 84, 14
Socrates, Justin's view of, 8, Ix ; 30, 8; 70, 11; 115, 2; 118, 14 ; 121, 9
Sodom and Gomorrah, 79, 16
Sotades, 129, 13
Spirit, Holy, see Holy Ghost
State, relations of Christianity to, xvi; 5,$5 ; 11,6 ; 15,9 ; 28,1$; 68,5 ; 107, 6 ; 125,2 ; 136 ; relations of Judaism to, xvi
Stoicism, Justin's views on, xiii; 32, 7 ; 33, 9 ; 114, 13; 116, 8
Subordinationism, possible, in Justin, xxii; 18, 2; 20, 6
Sunday, xxxix; 101, 13
T
Thetis, 4I, I
Tiberius Caesar, 20, 5
Trajan, 5, 5; 136

| U | W |
| :---: | :---: |
| Urbicus, 1; 104, 12 | Worship, Christian, 13, 17; 19, 4, 10 |
| V | X |
| Verissimus, name of Aurelius, xlviii | Xenophon, quoted, 122, 10 |
| Virgin-Birth, see Incarnation Vitrasius Pollio, 134, 25 | Zeus, myth of, and Cronos, 36, |

## INDEX II.

## SCRIPTURE REFERENCES.

## GENESIS

## PROVERBS

| i. 1 -3 $\quad$................... | 87, 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14,5 (n.) | ECCLESIASTES |
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## INDEX III．

## GREEK WORDS．

äßvoбos 87，14；89，17
a่ үа入入ıáoнаı 60，17；62， 17
à yandic 24，3，4，6；127， 15
árरapev́w 25， 17

ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon$ 有 10,$1 ; 53$ ， $10 ; 54,4 ; 76$ ， 13； $95,2,15 ; 111,5,6,15$ ； 112,$3 ; 114,3 ; 115,7 ; 120,5$ ； （of Christ） 94,$15 ; 95,26$


á $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \ell \nu \nu \eta \operatorname{tos} 21,4,7 ; 40,12 ; 73,15$ ； 78,$16 ; 112,5 ; 125,7 ; 127,14$
à үіаб $\mu \alpha 6_{3}, 4$
 79,$12 ; 90,16 ; 98,5 ; 100,9$
d $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ тos 113,$5 ; 121,16$
à $\omega \nu$ tá $\omega$ 6， 4
àmvl＇̧oual 20， $16 ; 21,2 ; 86,18$ ； 126，10；127， 5
$\alpha \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi 01$（of the Christians）97，15； 98， 3
diócaфopia 119， 2
¿̇dáфopos 119，I
ádád00pos 29， 9
à $\delta 0 \xi \in \neq \omega$ 74， 5
ácíswos 89， 16
á0avála 67， 5
dं $\theta$ ย́ $\mu$ เтоs 13,15
đ̈ $\theta$ єos 8,$1 ; 8,15 ; 9,8 ; 9,9 ; 15$ ， $5 ; 19,3 ; 45,7 ; 70,10 ; 86,17$ ； 117， 18

$\hat{\alpha} \theta \lambda_{0 \nu}^{7,11 ; ~ 124,2}$
átocos 123,3
aipecis 44， 6
aloonots 29,6 ； 30,$2 ; 34,10 ; 77$ ， 5， 11
altทots 20， 1
aiçv（ánépavtos）46， 5
aíbyıos 11,$15 ; 12,10 ; 16,6,10$ 22,$14 ; 27,16 ; 28,16 ; 29,7$ ； 36,$17 ; 69,20 ; 77,5 ; 97,20$ ； 105，7；106，10；115，9；117，7， II；II9， 5
áкатабкєи́aбтоs 87,$13 ; 97,3$
áкочбтเкós 78 ， 11
áкрitcos 8， $3 ; 15,10$
а́кроßибтіа 79， 26
äкта 56，6；72， 1 I
ä $\lambda \eta \pi \tau$ os 4,3
$\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \hat{\eta} 38,13$
à $\lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega 13,5$
$\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} 61,13,19$
ả入入ך入офо́vos 21， 10

$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \epsilon \theta \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s} 79,19$
à入入o七ó 116,2
$\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega s 7,2$
à入oyเбтalve 70， 1
ä入oros $3,1,7 ; 8,2 ; 13,6 ; 17,10$ ， $12 ; 83,7 ; 85$, II ；86，16；104， 13；108， 10 ； 118,5 ；123， 5 ； 126，I
ápaptia 53，14；54，6；57，14；66， $13 ; 73,7 ; 74,2,17,20,23 ; 75$ ， 18， 22 ；76，4；91，6，11；92，6； 98， 18
$\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda{ }^{\prime}$ s 22,$20 ; 23,13 ; 24,2$ ； 25,$2 ; 39,8 ; 57,14 ; 61,12$, 21

a $\mu о р \phi$ os 14,$5 ; 87,6$
aj $\mu v \delta \rho \hat{\omega}$ ． 128,3
aंvar $\gamma^{\hat{\wedge}} \lambda \lambda \omega 60,12 ; 62,24 ; 74,8$ ， 10


ảvaүрáфف 45,$13 ; 81,7 ; 88,6 ; 89$ ， $3 ; 95,7 ; 96,16$

बंvaठi $\delta \omega \mu \mathrm{t} 47,6$ ；101，20；107， 7 ďvalpé $\omega 15,15,17 ; 33,1 ; 39,8 ;$ 49,$14 ; 72,12 ; 85,13 ; 86,6$


àva入oria 28， 16
àvàúw 34，I；116， 3
àvá $\lambda \omega \sigma \iota$ s 33,8

ג̇ $\nu a \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \omega ~ 98,5 ; 101,3$
àvaтvò́ 83 ，เо

àvaбт $\rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} 14,7 ; 92,3$
 16； 84,$3 ; 90,4$
а่ข $\alpha \tau \rho о \pi \dot{\eta} 44,2$
àvaтpoфй 47,3
дддафе́ $\rho \omega$ 45，ІІ ；76，4；106， 9 ； 112 ， 2；118，9；126， 14
ảvaфúw 77， 9
àข $\delta \rho \circ \beta a \tau \notin \omega$ 126， 5
àv $\delta \rho 0 \phi_{0} \nu^{\prime} \omega{ }^{125}$ ，II
àv $\delta \rho \circ \phi b \nu$ os 47,$2 ; 108,12$
à $\nu \delta \rho \sigma \omega, 49,22 ; 55,1$
àv $\nu \gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \omega 38,2 ; 42,1 ; 50,1,3 ; 59$ ， $1 ; 72,5 ; 77,3 ; 82,11 ; 96,17$


à $\nu \in \lambda \in \gamma \kappa \tau$ Os 11,$9 ; 127,12$
à $\nu \in$ èevais $4 \mathrm{I}, 6$

àveछॄккакоs 25,13
àveтiцкктоs 9 ，і1
à $\nu \in \rho \chi$ оцає $35,2,8 ; 36,2 ; 50,4$ ；
64，1；71，2；75，5；81，8，12；
$82,3,5$ ；120， 11
àvecájoual 15, II
àvév́v就 70,$5 ; 84,5$
аंขөрштарєбкєia 2,14
ӓ้ยєцє 76， 6
 20；61，21；64，1；68，17；71，2； 72，9；75，3；96，9；100，16； 101， 17
àvoula 27,$14 ; 74,19 ; 75,14,16$ ； 76， 4
àvalip 26,1
àvт $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda a \gamma \mu a=24,18$
ävilypaфoy 102，14， 16


àvтוтuTé 12,4
àv $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ buaбтos 94,5
dं $\xi$ єépaбтos 118,16
$d \xi \cos (w$. dative） 14,6
$\dot{\alpha} \xi(\omega \sigma$ เs 85,$4 ; 103,10,15$
ábpatos 87,$13 ; 97,3$
dibpүทтos 25,14
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega 8,13 ; 49,20 ; 86,19 ; 108$ ， 9， 20
diтaүตүグ 80， 5
áraөavatǐoual 35,$14 ; 36,14$
ãäeia 105， 8


66,$23 ; 86,6$ ；109，1；110， 15 ； 128， 10
ȧтavтáa 68， $2 ; 88,8$
алара́ßaтos $65,{ }_{5}{ }^{12}$
аंтарєбкш ІІо， 6
ג̇тєвадтоs 46,5
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho і \tau \mu \eta \tau o s \quad 79,25$
 2I；84，6；86，I

ãıбтos 12，12；31，3；52， 24
а̇тоүрафй 54,16
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \epsilon \xi \iota \leq 22,4 ; 34,6 ; 39,4 ; 48$ ， 6，10；71，4，5；80，4；86，15； 95， 7
äтб́ठєктоs 64,14
ג̇тока入и́птш 74，10；94， $13 ; 95$ ， 23
аंтокоттомає 45 ， 10
ä $\pi$ бкрьбє 118,12

аіто入оүіа $6_{3}, ~ 13 ; 126,7$
ämo入úw II， 9
а̇тоципибуєчма 99，7；100， 1 I

äтоттоs 127,11
$\dot{\alpha} \pi 6 \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os（of Christ）18， $9 ; 94,15$ ； 95，8， 26 ；（of the Apostles）64， 2 ；
69,$12 ; 73,13 ; 75,8 ; 78,21$ ；
91,$15 ; 99,7$ ；100， 12 ；101， 19
а்тобтрофŋ́ 127,1
аітотаббоиає 73,15
ảтотє入є́ $\omega$ 93， 3
аітотротй 70，І
d．$\rho \in \sigma=$ о́s 11,$2 ; 14,11 ; 119,7$
ар риоріа 77， 8

áṕp̀tos 13,$7 ; 122,4 ; 125,7 ; 127$ ，
14

áp $\rho \grave{\eta \nu}(\tau \eta \nu) 14,4,10,13 ; 46,9$ ； 47,$2 ; 87,10 ; 113,1 ; 115,8$
dं $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \epsilon \omega 96,15$

d．$\sigma \omega$ tos 92,12

a0゙そうбレs III，I
aủтєรัov́のเos II5， 7
au่токрव́т $\omega \rho$ 1，1；35，14；84，2； 107，7；108， 15
аن゙то入єఢ̆є 50,$13 ; 52,20 ; 87,7$
ひ̈фєбเs 90,$10 ; 92,5 ; 98,18$
афөapoia 14，12；19，13；32，5； 60，6；64，4；77， 4
đ̊ $\phi$ Өaptos 14，9；60，5；123，8； 124，I
d $\phi \theta$ opos 23， 7
áфраір $\omega$ I22，II
áфроขтเซтє́ف 28， 14
à $\psi v \chi$ os 12,17
ßavavooupros 83， 5
ßáp $\beta$ apo九 9， 2 ；11，4；70， 12
$\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in i \alpha$ 15，9，14；（of heaven）22， 13,$18 ; 25,7 ; 27,8 ; 91,2$
$\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u ́ s(\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oủpav $\hat{\nu} \nu$ ）109， 2
$\beta \delta \in \in \lambda v \gamma \mu a 57,23$
$\beta \iota \beta \lambda \iota \delta \iota \circ \nu 47,6 ; 107,6 ; 128,8$

$\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \in \omega$ 49， 19
$\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu i a$ 37， 7
$\beta 60$ pos 30， 9
ßoùлєч 14,6
ßpaxuєாヘ̂s 73，20；119， 7
Bpuyubs＇s 27， 14
$\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma$ เs $24,14,16$
үанєтウ́ 106， 12
үย́єขขа 33，3， 4
$\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma$ เs 37,$4 ; 92$ ， 1
रevect ${ }^{2} 3^{8,1}$
रevitós 115,10
$\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu d \omega$（of Christ）20，3；37，14； 38，II ；49，21；53，18；54，9， $15 ; 55,1 ; 70,3 ;$（of the Logos） 18，3；34，18；37，4；113， 2
үє́ขขทนa 34，I 7
$\gamma \in \nu \nu$ रुт由р 20，IO； 36,8
ríivos 86，10， 21
үเข $\omega \sigma к \omega$ II4， 4
$\gamma^{\nu} \dot{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\mu}$ оs 49，8；5I，17；75， 2
үขшробтєко́s 128， 13
үра́цíца 2， 11 ；84， 3
Saıpovıáw Io6，I
баı $\mu \mathrm{\nu} \iota \stackrel{\lambda}{\mathrm{\lambda} \eta \pi \text { тоs } 30,4 ; 113,13}$

סalu $\omega$ 8，2，5，9，Ix，13；9，5，6； 13，I；15， 5 ；17， 9 ；20，14；36， 14；39，1；41，5，7，12；43，7； 46, I；61，7；68，6，19；77，5；
80,$7 ; 8 \mathbf{I}, 5 ; 84,8 ; 85,9 ; 86$ ， $9,17,18 ; 92,19 ; 93,9 ; 95,12$ ； 96，19；100，1；105， 11 ； 111,8 ， 16；II3，II， 20 ；II4，3，6；II5， I；117，3，6；121，12；122，7； I25，I；127， 2
§eเvórทs 104， 8
бєєбьঠal $\mu \omega \nu$ 3，I
סєктько́s 65， 5 ； 115 ，II
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi b \xi \omega 22,1 ; 68,15$
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta$ тŋラ（ $\theta \in o ́ s$ ）18， $9 ; 52,3 ; 56$ ， 18；61， $8 ; 66,8 ; 70,21 ; 90$, I5； 92，8； 112,8

סпицоupүє́ف 14，5；87，II
 43,$6 ; 86,13 ; 95,18 ; 12 \mathrm{I}, 17$
бıaßєßatov̂mal 3 I， 10
סıáßo入os 46，I
$\delta \iota a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda \omega \quad 62,9$
ס九ár $\omega$ 34， 12
סıaү由үท́ II，17；12， 3
סıaঠ́́ $\chi$ оиа 18， 4 ；103， 2
סıd́oōıs IOI， 4

Sıáкоขоц 98 ，II；IOI， 6
бцакрірш 114， 8
ঠıaбaфє́ف 53，4；63，14；80， 18
סıaбтáw 58， 3
סıa，úp 5 55， 18

ঠıатрофй 19， 8
סıaфорá 36， 5
סiraula 22， 20
$\delta i \delta a \gamma \mu \alpha$ 7，10；22，3；27，5，21； 30,$7 ; 85,5 ; 86,1 ; 106,7,8$ ；
110，9； 117,9 ， 2 I；124， 8 ； 127 ， 6；129，7，1I， 15
бібабкалєіिоע 108， 4
бьঠабка入ıa 120， 13
бьб́́бкалоs 18,$8 ; 20,2 ; 23,1 ; 27$ ， I； 32,$15 ; 35,1,6 ; 50,20 ; 87$ ， 4；107，13；117，13
 II
ס七égooos 6r， 16


бıкаเல́ш 58，17；75，21；9r， 9
бьоікทбเร 85，І7；107， 10

ббүна 11，3；34，9；43，12；44，5； $67,6,14 ; 86,17 ; 116,8 ; \mathbf{1 2 0}^{20}$ 7；121， 21

סо弓а́s 7,$6 ; 8,1 ; 16,4 ; 63,13$ ； 64,$6 ; 74,4 ; 89,18$
Soplá $\lambda \omega$ tos 5 I， 10

бра́ббоиає 62， 17
סúvaucs（＇miracle＇）27，12；41， 12 ； 48,$5 ; 84,15$ ；（applied to $\lambda$ b́ros） 22，8；38， 12 ；52，2；53，19；89， 7 ；122，3；（plur．＇faculties＇） 14 ， 15；28， 17

סuбкlขךтоs 105， 10
$\delta v \sigma \mu \in \tau \alpha ́ \theta \in \tau$ OS 105， 10
бибфךие́є 73， 19
סú $\sigma \neq \mu 0$ s 39，3；44，I；73， 17
є $\gamma к \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$ 57， 15 ；79， 14
є̇үкратєи́оцає 47， 4
є̇ $\gamma \kappa \cup ́ \mu \omega \nu$ 54， 2
そ $\operatorname{Oos} 17,14$ ；21，11；73，19；78，23； 85,$12 ; 9^{2}, 3$
є＜$\delta \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ оу 96,17 ；126， 1
єікорото七ét 31， 6
єiцap $\mu \in \nu \eta$－64，6， 11 ；65，7， 12 ； 67,12 ；114， $15 ; 115,5$ ；116， I
ci $\sigma \pi$ oı $\eta$ Tbs $\mathrm{x}, 4$
غंкатbутархоs 107，14， 20
ย̇катоутá犭є८р 41， 2
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \beta a^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ 23，3；12I， 14


éк $\delta v \sigma \omega \pi \epsilon \in \omega$ 106， 16
є́ккєขтёш 78， 5

є̇кишктทрі广ш 62， 6
ék ravtbs 11， 2
Єк $\kappa \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \omega$ 36， 5
ย̇ктєрเขобтє́ш 82， 9
 114， 12

єктабья 83,8
є̇ктіөпй 44，9；47， 1
$\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi$ is 105,6
ध $\mu \beta$ роут $\eta \sigma$ ia 13， 12
$\epsilon \mu \pi \alpha \theta$ जैs 85,12




द́ $\mu ф о \rho е ́ \omega ~ 80,2$
Є̇עápєтоs 6，7；16， $5 ; 69,1 ; 105$ ， 7，（－cs）36，15；119， 7
̇̇̀atєvi\} 63,16
 I

4I，II；42，IO；80，II；93，I，5；
95,$12 ; 96,18 ; 114,6 ; 117,2,6$ ； 124， 16
ėv $\partial \dot{u} \mu \eta \mu \alpha 23,5$
ěvpoia 36,$7 ; 4^{2}, 8 ; 97,10,11 ; 110$ ， 16；116， 7


ėvтo入ท́n 26， 13
 $68,8,11 ; 69,16 ; 75,4$ ； 117,20 ； 118，2；129， 15




$\epsilon \xi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \eta \eta_{s} 50,21$
${ }_{\epsilon} \xi_{\xi} \eta \gamma$ ồual 20,$12 ; 67,8 ; 90,5$

єॄ $\ddagger \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ 74， 4
द̇ $\xi=\mu 0 t b \omega$ 10， 1



غ̇ $\pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ 61， 6
є̇ $\pi a i \rho \omega$ 86， 2 I
є̇такои́ш 80， 15
є̇паขaү $\omega \gamma \dot{\eta} 38,13$
ย̇ $\pi a \rho \chi \iota \omega \dot{\tau} \eta$ S 103,10
ย̇ $\pi \alpha \sigma \sigma$ ทis 113,17
$\epsilon \in \pi \epsilon l \gamma \omega 7 \mathrm{I}, 5$
є̇ $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau$ á $\omega$ 73， 3

द́ $\pi \eta p \in d \xi \omega \mathrm{I}, 6 ; 24,8$


$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ ts 121,16
ė $\pi$ ly $\rho a \phi \eta \eta^{42,2}$


èmเкатทүоре́̀ 11,$5 ; 43,13$

ย̇тเки́pшбเร 69， 2
$\epsilon ̇ \pi i \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega 92,9$
èmilioyos 100,2
$\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \xi \mid \alpha 34,18$


є̇ாlпvola 88， 10
ध̇ $\pi$ lбкє $\psi$ เs 4,10 ； 30 ， $10 ; 68,12$ ； 101， 20
ย̇ாเซкเáそん 53，8；54，I


єंтוтротท́ 47，9
éritpotos 20， 5 ；54，18；61， 3
Є̇ாเфа́vєєa 8， 5 ；20，17；21， 12 ； 60， 9
$\epsilon \pi \backslash \chi \in เ \rho \circ \nu 65 ; 14$
 84，4；92，5


є́ $\pi$ оркі广它 II3， 15
є̇торкเбтท́s 113， 17
є́paбтท＇s 1，4；2， 9

épraбia 83， 4
द́p $\rho a \dot{T} \eta$ s 3，4；27， 13
${ }^{2}$ E $\rho \in \beta$ os 88 ，I


є́рท́भ $\omega \sigma$ เs 71，17；78， 20
غ́puatov 29， 5

є $\rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \sigma \iota s ~ 118,6,10,12$

єن̉aryềıa 99， 8


$\epsilon \dot{\cup} \in \rho \gamma \in \tau \in \omega$ 86， 4
$\epsilon \dot{\theta} \dot{\prime} \nu \eta$ 4， 2
єưəúv⿻ 6， 17

$\epsilon$ ủ̉ó $\gamma \omega \mathrm{s}$ 6， 6


єủnoü̆́ 112,9
єن́petท＇s 8I， 6
єúpurtia 19， 11
єビтovos 97，18；121， 9
єن̉фробúvท 63，19；64， 3
єúф＇unces 7，I2
єủ乙apıбтt́̄ 98，10，13；99，4，9， 11 ； 101， 5 ；122， 9
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є́ $\omega \sigma \phi \delta \rho o s 69,9$
〔九ßúvך 59， 7
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ ขуєи́ $\omega$ 47， 7
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láats 128，I
iotws 37， 3
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$\pi \rho о \delta \iota \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ 20， 14
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Apol. i 1. Cf. i 53.
    ${ }^{2}$ Tryph. 2 ff . Some suggest that this account is fictitious or at least trimmed up for artistic purposes. But we cannot be sure that it is not genuine. Events in life sometimes take place with artistic propriety. His conversion may have occurred at Ephesus, where (Eus. H.E. iv 18) the dialogue with Trypho is said to have taken place; but the claims of Flavia Neapolis, Corinth, or Alexandria have supporters.
    ${ }^{3}$ H.E. iv 8.
     which may mean that he acted as an itinerant evangelist.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ His martyrdom is attested by the title commonly given to him in Church literature. The Acta S. Justini philosophi (Ruinart, edition of 1859 p. 105) is now usually acknowledged to be an authentic account of the Apologist's fate, and it ascribes the event to the prefecture of Rusticus. The Paschal Chronicle gives the date as A.D. 165. Epiphanius (Haer. xlvi 1) says it occurred when Rusticus was $\eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega \dot{\nu}$, though he is wrong in placing it under the Principate of Hadrian. His statement that Justin was 30 years old at the time is probably mistaken; but he may have meant that Justin had been a Christian for 30 years. Cf. Harnack Chronol. Altchristl. Litt. i p. 282 ff .
    ${ }_{2}$ Eus. H.E. iv 16.
    3 Eus. l.c. The passage (from Tat. Or. 19) runs in Eusebius K $\rho \dot{\gamma} \sigma \kappa \eta s .$.
     $\theta a \nu \alpha ́ \tau \psi \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta a \lambda \epsilon \imath ิ \geqslant \pi а \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$.

    4 Apol. ii 8 (3).
    5 Allard llist. des persécutions pendant les deux premiers sidcles (edition of 1903), p. 390 note.

[^2]:    1 The popular belief in daemonic miracles and magic probably induced him to avoid using the argument from miracles; and he only mentions miracles of exorcism.
    ${ }^{2}$ e.g. i 9: $21:$ ii 12 . $\quad{ }^{3}$ e.g. i 14 .
    B.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ e.g. in i $20: 44: 59$, and in his treatment of O.T. prophecy.
    ${ }^{2}$ e.g. in i 3 I : 62 , possibly also in i 26 .
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$ i 21 : 22 .

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See later, p. xxii.
    ${ }^{2}$ Person of Christ. Period i, Epoch 2, § I.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. i $4: 7$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Mommsen Roman provinces Bk viii, c. xi.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Med. xi 3. The sole reference to Christianity in the Meditations.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner l'erson of Christ, Period i, Epoch ii, § I, who refers us to Tryph.61.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ On the point whether Justin was acquainted with the fourth Gospel, see later, p. xxxv.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner op. cit. Div. i, vol. i, note ttte, and his discussion in the text, to which the note refers.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner loc. cit. Donaldson Hist. of Chr. lit. and doctr. Vol. ii,

[^12]:    ${ }^{2}$ loc. cit.
    ${ }^{3}$ loc. cit.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other symptoms of confusion are noted later, p. xxviii.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Dorner loc. cit.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. ii ro, I note.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. it was a commonplace with Roman writers on education that women ought to study philosophy as an aid to virtue and to the proper conduct of household affairs.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Semisch Justin der Märtyrer ii 303 ff .

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ See p. xxviii.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Lightfoot's edition of Colossians, Introd.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note ad loc.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ The whole subject is fully discussed in W'estcott N.T. Canon, and in Stanton The Gospels as Historical Documents i p. 76 foll., to which the student is referred.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note ad loc.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ He even ascribes passages to their wrong authors in i 35, 10: 5 I , 8: $\mathbf{3} 3$, 10. His quotations bear most resemblance to the LXX version, but Credner (Beitrïge z. Einleit. in die bibl. Schriften) suggests that he is quoting from a sort of Ur-evangelium, consisting of a corpus of O.T. prophecies about Christ, in which the oldest parts depended on the Hebrew version, though it followed principally the LXX.
    ${ }^{2}$ E.g. he misquotes Plato in i 3, 3: 60, 1.
    ${ }^{3}$ As Westcott (op. cit.) puts it, Justin is only laying a foundation, and not building up the Christian faith.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Paul (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol., 1886,690 , and $1891,1+7$ ) concludes that Justin is not dependent on the Fourth (iospel, but that he is philosophizing on parallel lines to it, being however more closely related to the philosophic ideas of his time than is the author of the Gospel.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Mason Confirmation and Baptism p. 319.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Bethune-Maker Hist. of Chr. Doctr. p. 420.
    2 The Apologies say mothing about the Eucharist as a sacrifice in the technical sense.
    ${ }^{3}$ On the question whether Justin understond the words moteite toîto in a sacrificial sense, see (iore Body of Christ Appended note 20.
    ${ }^{4}$ E.g. Wordsworth Holy Communion p. 62.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ Body of Christ Appended note 1 .
    ${ }^{2}$ op. cit. p. 314. ${ }^{3}$ Bethune-Baker op. cit. p. 399.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Texte und Untersuch. vii 2, 1891.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sce note ad loc. The most complete refutation of Harnack's theory is provided by Zahn Brod und Wein im Alendmahl der alten Kirche.
    ${ }^{2}$ Theol. Lit. Zeit. xvii, 1892, p. 298; Die Apologicen J. d. M. p. xiv.
    ${ }^{3}$ Theol. Stud., 1892.
    4 Allchristl. Litt. Chronol. i p. $274{ }^{\circ}$
    ${ }^{5}$ Altkirchl. Litt. p. 202.

    - Justinus Rechtfertigung des Christentums.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1} H . E$ iv in.
    $2 i b$. iv 18.
    ${ }^{3}$ ib. iv 16 (cf. iv I5).
    ${ }^{4}$ ii $3(4), 2$ to i 10,1 ; ii $5(6), 5$ to i $23,2: 63,10,16$; and ii 7 (8), I to i $46,3,4$. See notes ad loc.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ But see note ad loc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Veil would see in i 46,5 a hint of a future discussion of the subject. there mentioned, such a discussion being found in ii 5 (6) and 10. But certainly the hint is far from clear; and the suggestion seems over-fanciful.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Capitolinus Verus 3.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ael. Ver. 5.
    ${ }^{3}$ Dorner, Kamsay, Otto, Krüger (Theol. Lit. Zeit., xvii, 1892, p. 298), Cramer (Theol. Stud., 1892).
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Harnack op. cit. p. 275.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Capitol. Marc. 2.
    ${ }^{2}$ Bury (Student's Roman Empire c. 30) suggests 148. Harnack (Theol. Lit. Zeit. xxii p. 77) $150-153$. Veil $153-155$.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ H.E. iv 16.

[^33]:     Otlo àmoктeival A

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ But Eusebius also quotes, with reference to the alleged miracle, the lard Histoire des Persécutions i 391 foll. testimony of Apollinaris. See Al-

[^35]:    i. 14
    18............................. 122, 3 (n.)

    24 ......... 22, 8 (n.); 38, 12 (n.)

